

ICAL ROOM  
AL LIBRARY  
OF MICH.

JUL 8 - 1936

VOLUME XXXI

NUMBER 3

*July 1936*

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

A *Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

---

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER  
CARL DARLING BUCK  
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

CHARLES HENRY BEESON, *Managing Editor*  
GORDON JENNINGS LAING  
JAKOB A. O. LARSEN  
RICHARD P. McKEON

HENRY W. PRESCOTT  
GERTRUDE SMITH  
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CAMPBELL BONNER, *University of Michigan*  
GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN, *University of California*  
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*  
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*  
ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, *Harvard University*  
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*  
KENNETH SCOTT, *Western Reserve University*  
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXXI

CONTENTS FOR JULY 1936

No. 3

New Messapic Inscriptions: Being Supplement II to *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy*

*Joshua Whatmough* 193

Organization and Procedure in Epicurean Groups . . . . .

*Norman W. De Witt* 205

The Development of Caesar's Narrative Style . . . . .

*J. J. Schlicher* 212

The Poems of Archias in the *Greek Anthology* . . . . .

*Helen H. Law* 225

Continuity of Time in Plautus . . . . .

*John N. Hough* 244

Notes and Discussions . . . . .

253

ROBERT V. CRAM: On a Verse in Vergil *Aeneid* II, 255 and the Post-Homeric Tradition concerning the Capture of Troy.—G. W. ELDERKIN: Dionysos Eleutheros and Liber.—W. HELMBOLD: *Anth. App. Plan.* (XVI). 54. 2.

Book Reviews

262

ALFRED KAPPELMACHER: *Die Literatur der Römer bis zur karolingier Zeit* (Beeson).—F. J. E. RABY: *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages* (Coulter).—LIONEL W. LYDE: *Contexts in Pindar with Reference to the Meaning of φύης* (Robinson).—BRUNO SNELL: *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis, post Fridericum Blaß et Guilelmum Suess* (Robinson).—E. ILIFF ROBSON: *Arrian: With an English Translation* (Oldfather).—CECIL FAIRFIELD LAVELL: *A Biography of the Greek People* (Larsen).—MAX MÜHL: *Untersuchungen zur aortalantischen und aethiopischen Gesetzgebung* (Larsen).—J. A. K. THOMSON: *The Art of the Logos* (Haight).—H. ST. J. THACKERAY AND RALPH MARCUS (trans.): *Josephus V: Jewish Antiquities*. Books v-viii (Coleman-Norton).—HEPHERA: *Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* (Johnson).—SOFOCLE AVACE: *Introduzione e commento di Mario Untersteiner* (Gay).—MARTINUS SKUTELLA (ed.): *S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim* (Green).—PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE: *La réaction patennae: Etude sur la polémique anticristienne du I<sup>er</sup> au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Green).—L. H. G. GREENWOOD (trans.): *Ciceron: "The Verrine Orations," Part II, Books iii, iv, and v* (De Witt).

Books Received

287

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Balearic Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.31). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

For Japan: THE MARUEN COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., 211 Honan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.25, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October, 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

AN

No. 3

193

205

212

225

244

253

262

287

of  
ar;  
ago  
olic  
ca,  
de  
nd  
ies  
are  
ta.

as,  
an.

as,  
a-

b-

k

-

d

l

a



# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXI

JULY 1936

Number 3

## NEW MESSAPIC INSCRIPTIONS: BEING SUPPLEMENT II TO THE PRAE-ITALIC DIALECTS OF ITALY

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

THIS second supplement to the *Prae-Italic Dialects* is concerned chiefly with new Messapic inscriptions, as the first (*Classical Philology*, XXIX [1934], 281 ff.) was concerned chiefly with new Venetic inscriptions. There is available a certain number of copies of both supplements which I shall be happy to supply, so long as they last, to any owner of the *Prae-Italic Dialects* who will apply for them. But I wish also to take this opportunity (1) to point out that Frank has independently (*AJP*, LVI [1935], 254 ff.) reached conclusions anticipated in *PID* (II, 186, 190) about the *tau gallicum*, and that most of Runes's worth-while conjectures (*Glotta*, XXIII [1935], 274) about words in the Cembra inscription (*PID*, II, No. 215) were anticipated in my Glossary (*PID*, Vol. III, s.vv.); (2) to call attention to what appear to be a new Raetic inscription and a new "East Italic" inscription (see further below); and (3) also to observe that Vetter (*Glotta*, XXIII [1935], 203) is wrong when he says that the "Messapic" inscription Ribezzo 137a is not in the *Prae-Italic Dialects*; it is there all right (Vol. II, p. 622, No. 28\*). But it is not a Messapic inscription; the letter *u* alone is against it, for there is no *u*-symbol in the Messapic alphabet. The first duty of any editor of Messapic inscriptions is to try to weed out the numerous forgeries, and this text, as well as some others accepted by Ribezzo, I confidently reject. Unlike other editors of Messapic inscriptions, alive or dead, I do not believe all that is told to me.

There is danger that the study of Messapic will shortly be obscured once more in the mists that involved it in the days of Deecke, unless students of the dialect are put on their guard. Not only are the directors of some of the museums in the Puglie ignorant of what their museums do or do not contain, as I know from actual experience; but a great deal of rubbish is offered as Messapic, some of which has taken in Ribezzo, who further shows in more than one place inability to understand what other scholars write. He has printed as Messapic at least one Greek inscription; at Oria there was shown to me even a Hebrew inscription, seven-branched candlestick and all, with the information that it was "Messapic"! The latter is an extreme case of the confusion that is easily possible among uninformed Pugliesi who wish to claim any and every scrap of inscribed stone as Messapic, but the former shows the need of great caution. The crowning glory, however, for this sort of blundering rests on the brows of the editors of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (L [1930], 187), who blandly allowed a contributor to label as Greek a Messapic inscription (*PID*, Vol. II, No. 393) which has been well known to the learned world since 1819!

\* \* \* \* \*

**251 bis:** The text, lightly incised in the face of the open rock on a hillside at *Sura Naquane* in the Val Camonica, appears to be Raetic.<sup>1</sup> It consists of four letters only, right to left,

**tiez**

of which the first is upside down (t), and the last (z) has the form known elsewhere (*PID*, Vol. II, n. xx bis, p. 631), but also is upside down as compared with the z of other Raetic inscriptions (*PID*, Nos. 250 ff.). This new inscription, therefore, agrees alphabetically with the western group of Raetic inscriptions to which its geographical position assigns it, and it is a welcome, though brief, addition to that scanty group of Raetic texts.

It is accompanied by rock engravings of a character which recalls those of Monte Bego in Ligurian territory (*PID*, II, 152), the date of which is disputed. The reader is referred to the account of them given

<sup>1</sup> Since this paper was written another new Raetic text (*PID*, No. 255 bis) has been reported to me from Castaneda; it will be published in *Harv. Stud. in Class. Philol.*, Vol. XLVII (1936).

by Battaglia in *Studi etruschi*, VIII (1934), 11 ff., where the new inscription was first published (p. 31, Pl. XXII).

It is hardly possible to say anything about the interpretation of the text beyond hazarding the conjecture that presumably it is a proper name, personal or divine. But there is nothing in it that conflicts with what we know already of Raetic. And, indeed, Pokorny's recent survey of the distribution of Illyrian names in Central Europe (*Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, XXII [1935], 314 ff.) shows clearly how the Raetic territory falls at the very meeting place of the Keltic and Illyrian linguistic streams.

Whether the medial puncts of Raetic inscriptions have the same value as that which they have in the Venetic inscriptions is a question opened anew by the appearance of Vetter's brilliant interpretation in *Glotta*, XXIV (1935), 114 ff. (anticipated by Thurneysen,<sup>2</sup> *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, IX [1892], 285 ff., esp. p. 288), which makes them indicate the consonantal, that is non-syllabic, value of consonantal symbols in consonant groups or when absolutely final. Unquestionably that explanation would apply to some Raetic forms such as *va'l-tikinu*, *es'tua*, *lup-nu*; but it now looks as if, in some Raetic inscriptions at least, the puncts, which are mostly single, not one on each side of a letter as in Venetic, are really interpuncts, that is they separate words, e.g., (*g*)*upiku perunis sxaispala*. Such a use, however, may actually have arisen from an older one in which a punct indicated a final consonant as such, e.g., *estum-*, *šnušur-*, whereas in a syllabary the final symbols would have a syllabic value (*me* or *ma*, *re* or *ra*, or the like).

\* \* \* \* \*

**335 bis:** Ribezzo has published briefly (*Rivista Indo-greco-italica*, XIX [1935], 93, n. 1) an "East Italic" text from *Capestrano* (about halfway between Aquila d' Abruzzi and Chieti), which he reads as follows:

**šak[ ]upahk.rāš.p(·)sútr[ ]niniš-rak  
inevhsp.m...ii**

<sup>2</sup> And, it should in fairness be added, by Hempl, wild as most of Hempl's conjectures are; see his *Mediterranean Studies* (1930-32), pp. 11, 39 ff., 343.

Until the inscription is published more fully, as it is expected that it will be in the *Notizie degli Scavi*, it will be better to refrain from discussing either alphabet or interpretation of this text. So far as I can now judge, Ribezzo's interpretation seems to be not altogether wrong. At least he is probably right in identifying *sútr* with the *foter*, *fotrif*, *šoteri* of certain other "East Italic" inscriptions (*PID*, Vol. II, Nos. 343 and 345).

\* \* \* \* \*

Several of the new Messapic<sup>3</sup> texts which follow were brought to light by N. Vacca, to whose courtesy I owe the privilege of seeing his account of them in *Rinascenza Salentina*, III (1935), 1-22 (cf. p. 59). I have arranged and numbered them here in such a way that any reader of the *Prae-Italic Dialects* may quickly insert them in the proper places. The new Messapic vocables should also be entered in the *Glossary* (Vol. III). Some corrections and additions to the reading of certain Messapic texts already known I give from other sources. But a large number of the thirty-odd texts given by Vacca I do not reproduce at all. Many of them I have published already in *PID*. And of those texts which Vacca prints for the first time I omit a few, being convinced that some are not Messapic, or if Messapic not genuine, others neither Messapic nor genuine, and yet others, if genuine and if Messapic, far too uncertain in other respects to merit serious consideration here.

**395 bis** (Vacca, No. 10): From a grave discovered in 1873 at the farmstead *Le Marine* between Taranto and Manduria. This grave, at a lower level beneath another grave, contained a skeleton and a few coins, said to have been of well-known types (not recorded). The inscription, which is no doubt funerary and a proper name, reads, right to left,

l a m e n [ ?

There is nothing to show whether the text is complete or not; but as a Messapic word, if complete, it has an unusual ending; a nominative form, presumably singular, would be expected, and the termination

<sup>3</sup> To the Bibliography in *PID*, II, 266, add now the excellent summary account of the Messapic dialect by Vetter (*Messapische Sprache*) in Pauly-Wissowa, Supplement-band VI (1935).

*-men* is as yet unknown among such forms in Messapic. Hence this word is probably incomplete, at least on the left. As for the forms of the letters, *l* is *v* (for *A*), hitherto recorded only once in a genuine inscription (*PID*, Vol. II, No. 394), *a* is the comparatively rare *A*. For the entire word compare perhaps *lamihon . . .* (No. 448. l. 4).

**Note xxxv bis** (p. 369, before No. 487; on 487 see below, No. 551): Reported briefly in *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1934, page 185 (*Scavi di Roca*), a fragmentary text, possibly Messapic (cf. now also *Riv. I.G.I.*, XIX [1935], 57, n. 1), reading left to right, in an alphabet which might be Messapic, or Greek, or Latin,

t a i o [

on a vase discovered, with other remains, near the walls of an ancient site, perhaps a port or harbor settlement associated with Lupiae (Lecce), at *Rocca di Melendugno*, roughly midway between Lecce and Otranto. We previously had, ready to hand for comparison, Messapic *taizhi* (*PID*, No. 474 a 7), and, still closer, Venetic *tahio-s* (No. 118); cf. *Taius* (*PID*, I, item viii C, p. 303).

**501 bis:** M. Bernardini has published in *Rinascenza Salentina*, III (1935), 163 ff., three Messapic texts on large rectangular pieces of *pietra locale* discovered in recent years at *Rugge* during agricultural operations. He gives no further details, and the copies which he reproduces are evidently far from good. It is not made clear how far the texts are complete or not.

1. 1.45 m. by 0.49 m. by 0.34 m.

g r a i v a i h i m o . a d . . . . t a s

Here I can make nothing of the meaningless strokes that follow *d*; all that remains of the letter transcribed *t* is the top crossbar (which might have belonged to *z*), and it is preceded by an identical sign. The word *graivaihi* (gen. sing. masc.) is well known. We have evidently an epitaph.

2. 1.16 m. by 1.47 m. by 0.42 m.

g a o r i o

3. 0.93 m. by 0.41 m. by 0.30 m.

i i . l . m o r . . v . h i a i i h      ?

Either the engraver or the copyist seems to have blundered here. The last word probably ended in *-vaihi*; it may even have been the familiar *graivaihi*. Presumably these are three separate inscriptions, not part of a single text.

**504 bis** (Vacca, p. 59): A block of stone measuring 0.46 m. wide, 0.27 m. high, and 0.33 m. thick, surmounted by a cornice (0.49 m. long and 0.10 m. high) and having a frieze (0.03 m. wide) at the base, discovered by accident in the course of normal agricultural operations early in 1935 at the Reale Istituto Tecnico Agrario at *Rugge*, the ancient *Rudiae*. The inscription is written in regular Messapic alphabet (with the addition of the now well-known  $\Psi$ , transcribed  $\Psi$ ), left to right, in letters from 1 to 2 cm. high. Now in the Museo Provinciale (Lecce).

$\Psi$  o t o r i i d d i . .  $\Psi$  a n a

Here we have the familiar word *θeotoridda*, "Tutoridia" (*PID*, No. 395), a patronymic, nom. sing. fem., with *-dd-* from *-di-*; cf. *θotorridas* (nom. sing. masc.). Messapic regularly shows simplification in one of two neighbouring pairs of double consonants (cf. *polonnihi* beside *pollonnihi*), and  $\Psi$  is a frequent variant writing of the sound also written commonly  $\theta$ , though *t* also occurs. In this text the engraver appears to have repeated *i* by error, and the final *-a* is lacking, either by accident or through damage to the stone. But  $\Psi$ ana<sup>4</sup> is new, and perhaps without parallel; compare, however, the Cisalpine names *Dania*, *Danus*, and *Tannia* (*PID*, Vol. I, items viii C, xii C, xv C; other examples and derivatives in Holder), and for  $\Psi$  ( $\theta$ ) beside *d* compare Messapic *taimakos* beside *δαιμαχος* (*PID*, II, 297, 564, 604; cf. my article in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XLII [1931], 150 ff.).

**514 bis** (Vacca, No. 24; cf. Ribezzo, No. 141 *bis*): Discovered at *Soletto* some years ago, in precisely what circumstances unfortunately is not recorded, on the estate of Dr. Luigi Mayro of Gallipoli; now in the Museo Civico at Gallipoli. A slab of "siliceous stone," with a flute along the upper edge; 1.28 m. long, 1.09 m. high, and 0.20 m. thick. There is a hole (recent?), about 0.20 m. in diameter in the stone; but the text appears to be complete nonetheless. The inscription reads,

<sup>4</sup> Unless we are to divide at *ana*, which would give a well-attested Messapic word.

in regular Messapic alphabet (*a* is A, open *r*, three stroke *s*), left to right,

k r a o t e d o n a s

clearly a proper name, gen. sing. masc. of a stem in -ōn (for the formation cf. *baledonas* 517, *xonedonas* 548.3), the base of which is hitherto unrecorded in Messapic. The *kretaaihi* (?) of 493 is altogether too dubious for comparison, being itself badly attested, and the alternation ū (*ao*):e altogether irregular. Compare rather Venetic *Crutonia* (*PID*, I, item vii C); and for the writing *ao* with the value ū note the Messapic coin legends of *Ūzentum* written *aozen*, or *taotorrihe*, *θaotor* beside Latin *Tūtor* (older Messap. *teo-*, *θeo-*; i.e., *Teu-tor*).

**522** (Vacca, No. 27), an improved reading of my previous text, reported from Ribezzo's incomplete account: The text is given by Vacca from the copy made by the late Canonico Francesco de Sanctis, and reads, left to right,

v a l l a o s p o t o r r e t a v i d i h [i] ?

There is a slightly larger space after *s* than after the other letters, which possibly indicates word-division, though word-division is not ordinarily marked in Messapic inscriptions. In any event, the word *vallaos*, gen. sing. masc., was already known (475). But it is difficult to be confident about what follows. Clearly *i* is wanting at the end, -*idihi* being a regular termination (gen. sing. masc., of a patronymic). But a new uncertainty is introduced at the beginning of the second word, namely, *to-* (or even *poto-?*), which Ribezzo had left in doubt (*po-* or *go-*). Is it possible that the copyist was in doubt between *to-*, *po-*, and *go-?* Conceivably *torretavidihi* is correct, compare *torihies* (436 b 16), *torehes* (486); and *po*, unless it is the copyist's alternative suggestion for the initial syllable—that is, if it is an independent word—may be some adverb or preposition or particle (cf. 572.2), though neither *potorre-* nor *totorre-* would be difficult to interpret. There is even a possibility that *avidhi* may be a separate word (*PID*, III, 8; s.v. *aviθos*). But certainty will not be attained unless either the original, or else a better or at least confirmatory copy, of this inscription is forthcoming.

**544 bis** (Vacca, No. 20; cf. Ribezzo, No. 147): A block of *pietra leccese*. The precise date of discovery is not recorded, but the inscrip-

tion was known to P. Maggiulli, of *Muro Leccese*, in the neighborhood of the ancient walls of which it was found, in 1926. Now in the museum at Muro Leccese (Palazzo del Comune di Muro Leccese). The front face measures 0.265 m. high, 0.205 m. wide, and is surmounted by a cornice 0.32 m. wide, the total height of the stone being 0.315 m. On the top surface are two rectangular cavities (0.016 by 0.01 m., and 0.004 deep). The inscription is doubtless votive, for the stone is manifestly either an altar or a base for a statuette, and the single line of letters runs across the front face from side to side just below the cornice. It is complete, and reads, in regular Messapic alphabet, left to right,

oççovaçnohazavaθi

Here  $\zeta$  is X; cf. *PID*, II, 531 ff. It is possible, though less likely, that before *n* we should read *x* instead of  $\zeta$  (*vaxnoha*). That reading is, I think, on the whole less probable, if we are to compare Messapic *vaçñihi* in 407 (see *PID*, III, Glossary, 49, s.v.). There is one important warning, however, which I think should be given. The text recalls another (No. 40\* in *PID*, II, 623), now at Arnesano, which also begins *oçço-*, but which is certainly a forgery. Even more astonishing is the circumstance that a mutilated inscription from a totally different site (*PID*, II, No. 553 [Vaste]) shows traces of a text which may have been identical with the present one, and which indeed Ribezzo has restored so as to be identical. The stone at Arnesano, I suspect, may have been produced by some mason who had seen either No. 553 or a copy of it; but what the relation of No. 553 to the present text is, remains a matter for inquiry. Both appear to be genuine, and there are many cases on record, in more than one language, of identical copies of ancient inscriptions, even from different sites.

*oçço* is presumably a name, nom. sing. fem., with the ending  $-ō$  that is especially common in Illyrian personal names (*PID*, III, 31; s.v. *moro*, cf. *mato*, p. 30); compare Venetic *ossoko s* (*PID*, Vol. I, No. 163). With it *vaçnoha* may belong, also nom. sing. fem., unless by chance it is the dat. sing. fem. of a divine name. In the last word (*zavaθi*) the initial letter is doubtful; the original appears to have  $\Xi$ , which may be an error for *z* (I), though possibly it stands for  $\Theta$  or  $\Pi$ , that is, *h*.

In either case we seem to have a verbal form, third pers. sing. of a present indicative active (cf. *hipakabi*, *inkermabi*, *hagarati*), meaning perhaps *dat*, *dedicat* or the like. I hazard no conjecture as to the etymology; but any reader who chooses to take the form as *zavaθi* rather than *havaθi* should be warned against attempting to use it to support the quite certainly erroneous and now totally discredited notion that Messapic is a satem dialect.

**546 bis** (Ribezzo, No. 148 *bis*),<sup>5</sup> from *Muro Leccese*: Said to have been engraved on a stele discovered some time before 1906, now lost. The reading (left to right) is extremely doubtful.

.das.ras.. |      ]ihi.[      ??

Ribezzo himself attempts no transcription, and mine is frankly tentative; *-ihi* may be a gen. sing. ending, and for *ras-* we may compare *rasi* . . . (PID, II, 554.3).

**548 bis:**<sup>6</sup> Engraved on a surface left flat between two flutes on the face of the drum of a column discovered in 1929 or 1930 at *Vaste*; now in the Museo Provinciale at Lecce, where it has been photographed and copied by Ribezzo (157); it reads, left to right, in Messapic alphabet,

θeotorasge[

that is, *θeotoras*, gen. sing. masc., and, as Ribezzo suggests, *ge[nollih]* or the like (cf. 573). The text was first published by M. Bernardini in *Rinascenza Salentina*, III (1935), 164.

<sup>5</sup> Ribezzo's No. 148 *ter* (after Vacca, No. 8), also from *Muro Leccese*, and known only from an unpublished copy by Castromediano, I have little hesitation in rejecting either as not Messapic, or, if purporting to be Messapic, as not authentic. It may be a copy of a genuine Messapic text, but in any event its incomplete words *Jnato[* and *Jirrin[* add nothing to our knowledge of Messapic. I cannot rid my mind of the conviction that the original was once at Lecce, and that it was recognized there as a forgery and destroyed.

<sup>6</sup> I give, with great hesitation, and merely in a footnote, as 548 *ter* the bare text (Ribezzo, No. 159) of a new inscription discovered at *Vaste* in 1926. Though it is dangerous to condemn a stone without having seen it, it is also rash, when doubts are aroused, to accept a stone "sight unseen." My doubts are aroused in this case because (1) for some years after its reported discovery the stone was not to be found; (2) the engraving is quite unlike genuine ancient workmanship; (3) all except one word in the two lines of text seem to me to have been made up from already known Messapic vocables, while the single innovation is unintelligible. The text is *]danina poaosgrosdihiinker*

[      |      ]*daninxilpaihidazinnihinaii*].

**548 quater:** Discovered at *Vaste* in 1926, now in the Museo Nazionale at Taranto, a broken piece of marble measuring 0.27 m. by 0.185 m. Incomplete on the left; written left to right in the normal Messapic alphabet.

] t i n a s a

It is idle to conjecture whether or not this fragment contains part of one or parts of more than one word (Ribezzo, No. 160).

**Note xxxix bis** (II, 411): Three letters on a fragment of a stele also found at *Vaste*, and important chiefly as showing the Σ (ζ) and Ω (ϙ) of the old Messapic alphabet. Written right to left,

] ζ ο ϡ

The stone is said to have been used a second time in Byzantine times for a Greek inscription which is not reported (Ribezzo, No. 160).

**549 bis** (on 549 see 552 below): Discovered at *Vaste* in 1918 or 1919, and for long hidden away, inaccessible and invisible, in the Museo Nazionale at Taranto. This text is also retrograde (right to left), and shows not only Τ (Ϝ) but also an unusual form of *m* (ΜΜΜ). It stands on a slab measuring 0.88 m. by 0.32 m. by 0.195 m., broken off at the extreme left, where the inscription also breaks off short, adjoining a circle engraved in the stone (perhaps intended originally to serve as a sundial?), and, farther to the right, a rectangular pattern engraved so as to imitate tiles. The text seems to read

a r Ψ a m [

Compare Messapic *artemes* (424), *artahaihi* (430) (Ribezzo, No. 158).

**551:** Following a copy made by Maggiulli and Castromediano, Ribezzo (No. 151), whom I followed in *PID*, reads *sp[əθi]llai*, and combines this fragment with three others, one from the same source (Maggiulli and Castromediano), the remaining two being extant, one at least of them in the Museo Provinciale at Lecce, where I saw it over twelve years ago. I now recognize it as part of my No. 487, which should, therefore, now be removed, and joined with my No. 551 to make a single text. But I saw yet another fragment, also at Lecce, of this well-head (as it now appears to be, not an arch), and I read it quite differently from Maggiulli and Castromediano (and hence quite differently from Ribezzo). No doubt the stone had dried out between the period 1900–1905, when they knew it, and 1923, when I saw it,

and the hard mud had crumbled away, leaving the letters clear. The correct reading, then, would appear to be (487 and 551 combined), in the present condition of the fragments, left to right,

daze[tsp...]xalaizna[...]bradit...[

from which the letters *tsp* have been lost by breakage since Maggiulli and Castromediano saw the original. Having actually seen the part reading *]*jalaizna*[* myself, I have no confidence whatever in the older reading, namely, *]*lplainnes*[*, and the word *spaθillai*, on which conjectures about the termination of the dat. sing. of *ā*-stems in Messapic have been built, vanishes entirely. Even now the text is too fragmentary to warrant any attempt at conjectural restorations or interpretation, beyond at least recognition of the well-known nom. sing. masc. *dazet*; *xalaizna* may be a complete word, but that is far from certain.

**552.** This inscription has now been transferred to the Museo Nazionale at Taranto; with it are associated other fragments containing a few more letters than Droop reported in 1906, but there is nothing to show that the several fragments belong together. Add (Ribezzo, No. 155):

b)      ].**i**d**k**o[      |      ]**l**    a*ii*[

Ribezzo's No. 155c is my No. 549; he considers *oras* to be incomplete at the beginning (read *taot]oras* vel sim.?).

**554 bis:** A number of fragmentary texts, six in all, repeated by Ribezzo (No. 154) after Maggiulli. Presumably they all belong to *Vaste*. I omit Ribezzo's *d* and *e*, which are Greek, not Messapic. The rest are, reading left to right,

- a)      ]**h**i**a**p**a**d[      ?      (on a vase)  
 b)      ]**h**i**a**p[      ?      (on a vase)

In both of these *h* is † or †'; in (a) the third letter is *Λ*, for the *A* of (b).

- c)      ]**d**a**s**.**s**i**r**ā[      (on a stone)  
 f)      ]**d**r[      (stone)

These are given for the sake of completeness. They add nothing to our knowledge of the Messapic dialect.

**567 bis** (Vacca, No. 25): Of uncertain provenance, but thought to have been found at *Vereto*, this inscription passed into the Museo

Civico at Gallipoli in 1931. Two broken lines of text, written left to right in normal Messapic alphabet, on a fragment of brown siliceous stone, the rectangular and linear working of which (a band and square indentations) recalls that of 574 bis (below), and suggests that the two pieces may be parts of one and the same, originally much larger, stone. The present fragment is about "8 or 9 square dm." in size, that is, I suppose, measures about 0.30 m. each way.

]anmitooh[ | ]epitar[

**570 bis:** Ribezzo now reports that *Vaste* was the source of the fragment *PID*, No. 570, to which he adds another (Ba. 5), left to right,

]vila*hi*

apparently entirely unconnected with my No. 570.

**574 bis** (Vacca, No. 26): Unknown provenance; now in the Museo Civico at Gallipoli; perhaps part of No. 567 bis above. Broken on both sides; the text runs, left to right,

]essis[ | ]eneoh[

This, like so many of the other newly discovered texts, is too fragmentary to tell us anything that would help in answering some of the numerous questions with which the fascinating remains of the dialect of the Messapii still perplex us.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

## ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE IN EPICUREAN GROUPS

NORMAN W. DE WITT

ANCIENT writers afford us but little information concerning the internal organization and working of philosophical schools, such matters being universally known at the time and seemingly unworthy of mention. It happens, however, that the Herculanean roll containing the *τερπι παρηγοῖς* of Philodemus, in spite of its fragmentary state, throws a fairly ample light on the procedure followed in Epicurean groups. Such information, of course, is not directly revealed but must be deduced from the tacit assumptions of the author. For example, since the practice of accepting fees as a token of gratitude for the correction of faults is defended in the case of Epicurus (frag. 55), it may be inferred that fees were collected on this basis in Epicurean circles generally. In these pages the notation of A. Olivieri (Teubner, 1914) will be followed, that is, Arabic numerals for isolated fragments and Roman numerals for columns where the sequence of fragments is preserved.

It goes without saying that any member of an Epicurean group who possessed the requisite self-confidence was at liberty to migrate elsewhere and undertake to organize a group of his own. In so doing, however, his relationship to prospective followers was predefined in a peculiar way, because Epicureanism was primarily a cult of the founder and his way of life and only secondarily a system of thought. Even more important than the so-called Principle Doctrines was this voluntary pledge (45, 8–11), "We will be obedient to Epicurus, according to whom we have made it our choice to live."<sup>1</sup> Underlying this is the tacit assumption that Epicurus had discovered the one and only true way of life, and that there could be only one discoverer; subsequent leaders could only guide and direct their followers along that road. In other words, the leaders were themselves followers, and their adherents were followers of followers. They differed from one another only in the degree of their advancement toward wisdom.

<sup>1</sup> Seneca *Epistles* xxv. 5: "Sic fac omnia tamquam spectet Epicurus."  
[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, XXXI, July, 1936]

It was part of the system that the head of the school should be treated with veneration since he was presumed to be far advanced in wisdom. The proper disposition of the follower toward him is well described in a surviving fragment (40): he was to be regarded as a father-confessor; mistakes and shortcomings were to be frankly disclosed to him in confidence; followers were to place themselves in his hands as their sole guide in right thinking and right conduct; they were to regard him as their savior and to declare in the words of Homer (*Iliad* x. 246-47), "With such a one as this for my comrade we should both return safe even out of a flaming fire, because he is exceeding clever to devise." It may be mentioned that the Epicureans, like other ancient moralists, employed quotations from the poets to support their particular doctrines. In this instance the young Epicurean seeking wisdom under the leadership of the sage is compared to Diomede setting out enthusiastically on his nocturnal adventure with his trusted friend Ulysses.

The *sapiens* is not sustained in his position by any rigid scheme of offices. One member stands higher than another only by virtue of superiority in wisdom. The word "better" (*κρείττων*) denotes one farther advanced in wisdom (44, 7-8). The word "master" does not occur. The basis of the system is good will, voluntary co-operation, and friendship. Metrodorus and Hermarchus, who had stood close to Epicurus in Athens, were called "guides" or "leaders" (*καθηγεμόνες*<sup>2</sup>), but in this essay of Philodemus a synonym of less dignity from the same root is regularly employed (*καθηγηταί*). It is manifest from the contexts that this term denotes the teachers, though the latter word is avoided as being out of harmony with the spirit of Epicureanism, the adherents of which were not taught but led or guided. It may be mentioned that Plutarch describes an incident of school life in which the person in charge is called *καθηγητής*.<sup>3</sup> Since in our essay the word occurs regularly in the plural, it may be assumed that the scholars are divided into small groups, each in charge of a leader.

The effective principle in the organization is, of course, love, *φιλία*, which Roman writers narrowed materially by rendering it *amicitia*. The leader is to be regarded as the best of all friends (41, 4-8). Friendship

<sup>2</sup> Philodemus *De ira* xlvi. 1-14 (Teubner: C. Wilke, 1914).

<sup>3</sup> *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur* xxxi (70 E).

expresses itself in the form of mutual concern for the good of one another, good will, and gratitude. Everyone is to be imbued with a feeling of responsibility (*κηδεμονία*) for the good of all. In one passage (26, 4–7) we read, “Let us keep before our eyes the superiority of the admonition that is actuated by a concern for the good of the admonished [*κηδεμονικὴ νοιθέτησις*.]” A main objective is to create an atmosphere of good will and to strengthen it; one caption (25, 3–8) in the essay reads, “How through correction we shall heighten the good will of the students [*κατασκευαζόμενοι*] toward ourselves in spite of the very process of correction.” No less important than good will is gratitude, of which the Epicureans established what was almost a cult. Even the *sapiens* will be grateful for a reminder from another *sapiens* (VIII<sup>a</sup>, 1–2 and VIII<sup>b</sup>, 12–13). He will be grateful also for criticism from a *φιλόσοφος* or a *φιλόλογος*, even though not belonging to his own group (X<sup>a</sup>, 1–5 and X<sup>b</sup>, 11–13).

The first objective is to create a disposition (*διάθεσις*) amenable to correction. This applies more specifically to the youngest recruits, denoted in the essay as *κατασκευαζόμενοι*. They are subject to reproof and admonition from all members of the group, even from one another. They learn to regard superior wisdom with respect, to control their tongues and their tempers, to confess their faults, and to be open and frank in all their conduct. Slyness and secretiveness (*λαθροπραγεῖν*) are to be considered the worst of all offenses against friendship (41, 1–4). On account of their youth they are treated with gentleness so that they will learn to submit to correction (2, 1–7), because the wise man knows beforehand that the young are prone to be stiff-necked (71) and easily irritated (31, 1–3). Their characters become the subject of detailed study, as will be exemplified presently.

Upon enrolment the lad was exhorted to spurn all other knowledge (music, rhetoric, and geometry) as alienating him from the pursuit of happiness (18, 1–2). Seemingly, part of his early guidance comes from the *φιλόλογος*, who is regularly mentioned after the *σοφός* and *φιλόσοφος* (VIII<sup>a</sup>, 7–9 and X<sup>a</sup>, 1–2). That the *φιλόλογος* is a junior may also be inferred from the mistakes against which he is warned, namely, interpreting the misconduct of students as a personal affront to himself and resorting to a blustering, high-keyed, insulting, belittling, and sarcastic style of correction (37). That the *φιλόλογος* was a

teacher seems reasonable not only from contexts in this essay but also from a statement of the grammarian Phrynicus that the word denotes one primarily interested in education.<sup>4</sup> That his sphere was instruction in literature seems clear from the word itself. It is erroneous to assume that the Epicureans scorned this study. Epicurus found a basis in a very hedonistic passage of the *Odyssey* (x. 5–11) for declaring pleasure to be the highest good,<sup>5</sup> and references to tragedy and comedy are not infrequent in the essay before us and in other Epicurean writings.

That the *σοφός* and *φιλόσοφος* stood in the closest relationship to each other is made clear by their mention together and without the *φιλόλογος* (1, 7 and 35, 2–3). It need not be doubted that the *φιλόσοφος* was one who was relatively far advanced in philosophy and stood to the chief as a sort of associate professor, while the *φιλόλογος* was an assistant professor. Touching the problem of perfection, the writer of this essay does not assume that it is attainable at all, as the following extract will show (46, 5–11): “For how will he [sc. *sapiens*] hate the one who commits pardonable mistakes, remembering that he is not perfect himself and that all men are accustomed to err?” This principle, of course, is democratic and diminishes the interval between the head of the school and his associates.

Lower than the *φιλόσοφος* in respect of advancement in wisdom is the class which Philodemus regularly denotes by “we.” At first blush this might seem to be a plural of modesty, denoting the head of the school and his closest associates; but this assumption is ruled out by the following (35, 1–4): “Above all things we will seek to admonish, though not like the *σοφός* and the *φιλόσοφος*.” Closer scrutiny makes it certain that the *συνηθεῖς* or *familiares*, the ranking members of the group, are the class denoted. That these, in turn, are more advanced in wisdom than the majority becomes clear from one of those underlined captions that occur here and there in the roll (56, 1–3): “Whether we who are advanced in respect of power of reasoning [*λογισμός*] will make a failure of it.” Incidentally, the answer is that they will not, though to miss the mark occasionally is not impossible because of the inability of human beings to be adequately on their

<sup>4</sup> Liddell and Scott, 8th ed., s.v. II, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Ettore Bignone, *Atene e Roma*, XII (1934), 15–16.

guard continually. These *familiares*, however, even if falling considerably short of the highest attainable perfection, may be assumed to have attained to a disposition (*διάθεσις*) amenable to correction, which is the preliminary objective of the system.

If a disposition amenable to correction is desirable on the part of students, still more desirable is a disposition rightly adapted to the administration of correction on the part of the leaders. Proper correction will come from one "actuated by good will, devoting himself intelligently and diligently to philosophy, steadfast in principle, careless of what people think of him, immune from any tendency to demagoguery, free from spitefulness, saying only what fits the occasion, and not likely to be carried away so as to revile, jeer, belittle, injure feelings, or resort to tricks of wanton acquiescence or flattery (I<sup>b</sup>, 2-13)." The opposite will be expected of one "with an unbridled tongue, prone to blame others, light-minded so as to be incensed at slight affronts, bickersome, truculent, or bitter (II<sup>a</sup>, 1-7)." This is but part of the extant description, but it would seem adequate.

The technique of correction itself is worked out to considerable detail. The treatment of it exemplifies that process of elaboration to which the original doctrines of founders like Epicurus were subjected by successive teachers. Ethical correction became a specialty of the Epicurean schools and developed its own vocabulary. It is simple (*ἀπλῆ*, 10, 4; 35, 8), that is, straightforward and direct, or mixed (*μικτή*, 58, 7-8), that is, compounded of reproof, generous praise and exhortation (68, 3-7). It is a many-sided fine art (*ποικίλη φιλοτεχνία*, *ibid.* 1-2). It may be administered by the *sapiens*, by one of the *familiares*, or even by one of the fellow-students; it must not be applied incessantly or for all offenses, nor for the chance mistake, nor in the presence of people not concerned, nor discursively, but sympathetically and without insult or abuse (79, 4-11). Some students may be better admonished without the knowledge of the leaders (*καθηγηταί*, 8, 4-8). Cases occur where it seems unwise to administer reproof before the group (35, 7-11), but elsewhere mention is made of students who are reproved before their fellow-students for wearing Greek cloaks (31, 4-8). Reporting of misdemeanors committed by fellow-students is approved as an act of genuine friendship, and failure to report will stamp a man as "an evil friend and a friend to evil" (50).

Tale-bearing, however, is carefully distinguished and discouraged (*ibid.*).

Just as the *Characters* of Theophrastus is a logical sequel to the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, so the observation of the characters of students is a natural sequel to this elaborated system of correction. Students are recognized as impressionable, or wilful and more in need of a check (7, 1-5), weak and incapable of being cured by correction (59, 9-11), or of ugly dispositions (86, 1-2). Some lack previous guidance or have been given up as incorrigible (84, 8-12). Others, born beyond the reach of those influences that create a disposition amenable to good will and friendship, and lacking the example of leaders for imitation over a long space of time, will be lazy and dilatory and never show great improvement (V). Students imitate the faults of their leaders along with their virtues (43, 3-4); no example of this survives in our text, but Plutarch in a similar passage mentions that they imitated Aristotle's lisp and Plato's stoop.<sup>6</sup> Among other points mentioned are these, that some young people are irritated by correction (31) and that those who feel the need of showing off before crowds and of having honors from the many are especially hard to save (34, 3-8).

The analogy between this system of corrective ethics and the practice of medicine is frequently emphasized. It was to the advantage of the student, they taught, to have just such a disposition (*διάθεσις*) toward the sage as he had toward the physician. Students were urged to bear in mind, for example, how utterly disgraceful it would be never to make trial of the admonition of the sage, just as if they should take it upon themselves to assume entire charge of their health and under no circumstances to make use of physicians (39, 7-14). Again, if the sage should err and correct a student for a mistake of which he was innocent, to assume that similar correction would never be needed on other occasions would be to commit the same error as a physician who, having once given a patient a purge through a false diagnosis, never afterward purged him in other illnesses (63). Once more, urging the necessity of repeated corrections, the authors cite the practice of physicians who, accomplishing nothing by one enema, administer another (64, 6-12). Lastly, just as a physician will continue to attend a patient who may reasonably be considered incapable of cure, so the

<sup>6</sup> *O.p. cit. ix.* (53 C-D).

ethical monitor will not halt in his ministrations if his admonitions fail to meet with response (69).

This, then, was the organization of the Epicurean brotherhood: *σοφός, φιλόσοφοι, φιλόλογοι, καθηγηταί, συνηθεῖς* and *κατασκευαζόμενοι*. These differed from one another only in the varying degrees of their advancement toward wisdom, and none attained so near to perfection as to be immune from error. Each looked to those above him as his leaders, and all looked beyond their immediate leaders to Epicurus as their model. All were commanded to cultivate a feeling of gratitude toward him for having discovered the true way of life and to their fellow-adherents for assisting them to follow it. All aimed to habituate themselves to receive admonition kindly and to administer it frankly and gently. All were to be animated by good will, and everyone was urged to become an apostle, never ceasing to proclaim the doctrines of the true philosophy.<sup>7</sup> Lastly, the leaders were genuine psychiatrists, engaged in purifying men of their faults just as the physician purified their bodies of disease.

VICTORIA COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

<sup>7</sup> *Vatican Collection*, 41; C. Bailey, *Epicurus* (Oxford, 1926).

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAESAR'S NARRATIVE STYLE

J. J. SCHLICHER

OUR knowledge of the predecessors of Caesar in the field of historical composition is too scanty to permit very extensive conclusions as to their style. We know, to be sure, that Cicero and his entourage had no high opinion of them. The earlier ones are put in a class with the predecessors of Herodotus (*De or.* ii. 51–54); and even when Cicero admits an improvement, beginning with Caelius Antipater, he mentions the individual historians chiefly to call attention to their faults (*Leg.* i. 5–7). Nevertheless, they were not only predecessors, but forerunners of Caesar in a very real sense. The quotations from their works, though hardly ever more than a sentence in length, and usually less, are in a few cases numerous enough to furnish pretty clear evidence on that point. If we compare the language of Caelius Antipater with that of Claudius Quadrigarius and Sisenna, who wrote some forty or fifty years later, we can see signs of a change which was to reach its culmination in Caesar.

The point may be illustrated by a single characteristic feature of their style. One of the chief problems of historical writing is how to present the separate events or acts which make up a situation in such a way as to preserve their sequence in time and also to show their relations to one another and their relative importance. In striving for this goal a narrative sentence form was developed during the half-century above mentioned in which the action expressed by a dominant verb is preceded by one or more preliminary or contributory events, each expressed by a subordinate clause or a phrase. This was a natural development for the time. For we are told in the *De oratore* (iii. 198, as of 91 b.c.) that the periodic sentence was then a recent venture for the Romans; and as it was new and effective we are not surprised that it quite displaced the blunt and monotonous sentences of the earlier annalists.<sup>1</sup> So prevalent, indeed, did this form of the sentence become that in a total of about 2,530 narrative sentences in Caesar we find

<sup>1</sup> Cicero speaks of the period as especially suited to history (*Or.* 207).

some 2,170 dominant verbs, each preceded by one or more phrases or clauses expressing preliminary or contemporary events or circumstances.<sup>2</sup> Such groups are far less common in the speeches and descriptive passages. Their frequency in these is as 3 to 8, compared with the narrative, and they are also much simpler, very few of them having more than one preliminary phrase or clause.

While this feature of narrative prose first strikes us, as things are, chiefly in Caesar, it is quite likely that earlier writers—Sisenna, for example—anticipated a development of it which Caesar was to achieve only in the course of his writing. We shall find that Caesar's language at the beginning of the Gallic War was rather conservative when compared with what it became later. As he proceeded he fell in with the general trend of narrative, which was in the direction of a larger use of the participle in place of the subordinate clause. The older practice was still continued, apparently, in official and semiofficial reports, like those of a governor giving an account of the year's campaigns in his province. We have examples of these in several letters written by Cicero during his proconsulship. *Ad familiares* xv. 1 and 2 are addressed to the magistrates and the senate. The first has five preliminary subordinate clauses in seven narrative sentences, and two ablative absolutes, but no participles. The second contains eleven narrative sentences, with nine preliminary *cum*-clauses, two ablative absolutes, and three participles. *Ad familiares* xv. 4, addressed to Cato, and at least semiofficial, has 22 narrative sentences, with 15 temporal clauses, 14 ablative absolutes, and five participles. The extraordinary stiffness and monotony of the language in these letters—so different from Cicero's usual manner—is, of course, not a matter of literary style at all, but the customary jargon of the official report, explicit and standardized, like other actions of officialdom.

The period of Caesar's authorship, as we have it, was a short one, less than a decade and a half, but it was a time of earnest discussion about literary form as it was of political upheaval. The first and most important single event in this discussion was the appearance of Cicero's *De oratore* in the early part of 54 B.C., at a time when the relations between him and Caesar were becoming very close. It was at

<sup>2</sup> A sentence has been counted as extending from one period or similar full stop to the next. The dominant verbs may be either in principal or in subordinate clauses.

this time that Quintus Cicero went to Gaul as a legatus, and we have an unusually full record of the relations between the three men and their common interests in the letters from Cicero to his brother. There is frequent mention of literary work, done or planned. We hear of five tragedies written by Quintus during this time. There are critical remarks about the work of two poets and two historians. Cicero himself has written a poem on his times, of which he seeks and obtains Caesar's opinion,<sup>3</sup> and there is also a second poem, celebrating Caesar's expeditions into Britain, of which more later. And, finally, Caesar writes his *De analogia*, which he dedicates to Cicero, and which, in a sentence from its Introduction, quoted in the *Brutus* (253), contains a distinct reference to the *De oratore*. So it is clear that Caesar had read this, and the language of the subsequent dedication of his own work to Cicero may be taken at the very least as a tribute to its importance.<sup>4</sup>

If it is evident, then, that Caesar was actively interested in matters of literary usage at the time, we may assume that this interest was not unconnected with his own composition of the commentaries. The style which he employed in writing them—*nudi enim sunt, recti et venusti, omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta*—was specifically chosen by him, for they are not plain *commentarii* in the usual sense, with no pretensions to literary form.<sup>5</sup> We are told in the same connection (*Brut.* 261) that in his oratory, by contrast, he did employ *illa oratoria ornamenta dicendi*.

Now, one of the basic assumptions of the *De oratore* is that the orator, by reason of the wide and varied material and appeal that his occupation forces upon him, must be a master of every kind of expression needed in this task. It is he alone who controls all the tools of eloquence, and it is to him that the workers in all the special fields of intellectual endeavor must look for them. This idea is developed at some length by Antonius in Book ii. 33 ff. But here a strange thing happens. While Antonius thus brushes aside any need of discussing a special style of eloquence for the philosopher, the jurisconsult, and the rest, he makes an exception of history, to which he accords a treatment

<sup>3</sup> *Q. Fr.* ii. 16. 5.

<sup>4</sup> The whole matter has been discussed much more fully and with a different purpose by Hendrickson (*CP*, I, 110–19).

<sup>5</sup> *Brutus* 262, and *BG* viii. Introd. 5.

somewhat apart (ii. 51-64). It is a curious passage, both in the abruptness with which it is introduced and in its apparent inconsistency with the whole tenor of Antonius' preceding remarks. For it not only goes at some length into the record of historical writing in Greek and Latin, with a comparison of the two and an explanation of its failure to attain excellence at Rome, but also enumerates the rules as to subject matter which it should observe and defines the style which it should employ. This, together with the repeated statement that such a thing has not been done in the rhetorical treatises heretofore, appears remarkable, to say the least, in the midst of a discussion which denies the necessity for a special treatment of the style suited to each separate field.

The passage can, no doubt, best be accounted for by Cicero's personal interest in the improvement of historical writing. He had recently been exerting himself without much success to have the events of his consulship recorded in a manner befitting what he considered to be their importance to the state,<sup>6</sup> and he may have begun to realize that he would have to write the history himself—indeed, he had mentioned this possibility in his letter to Lucceius. He had already some years before this collected the material in a *commentarius*, written in no simple style itself, and Posidonius, to whom he sent it, had politely declined his request *ut ornatus de eisdem rebus scribebet*.<sup>7</sup> Whether Cicero knew of Caesar's writing the commentaries on the Gallic War, then entering upon its fifth year, we are not told, but it is likely that he did. For it will appear, I think, from an analysis of the changes in Caesar's style that the seven books could not well have been written at one time.<sup>8</sup> It is certainly noteworthy that with all the importance Cicero attaches to *ornatus* in the writing of history, he does not mention it in the chapters of the *De oratore* which we have just referred to. It might seem that to mention it would be out of harmony with the views of Antonius, who did not give much thought to the form of speech. But the whole discussion seems to be equally out of harmony with his habit of reading history only for entertainment. We might

<sup>6</sup> *Fam.* v. 12 (to Lucceius) and *Att.* iv. 6. 4; 9. 2; 11. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Att.* ii. 1. 1-2.

<sup>8</sup> I cannot go into the general controversy on this point, where views depend so much on interpretation and relative stress, but will merely refer to the detailed summary by Kalinka in the *Jahresbericht* for 1929.

regard the passage as a subtle compliment to Caesar, who was a devotee of the plain style. For it tallies admirably with Cicero's later description of the style of the commentaries in the *Brutus*.

But, however that may be, Caesar would certainly be interested in a passage which bore so directly upon his own undertaking and agreed so well with his own stylistic creed. And it would be Cicero's description of the style suited to history that would interest him most, for, as Cicero says, the fundamental principles of historical composition and the materials it deals with are matters of common knowledge. This style, according to Cicero, should be *fusum atque tractum et cum lenitate quadam aequabili profluens*—quite different from that employed by the orator in the law-courts. And this principle, specifically stated in this way, would probably be new to Caesar as it would be to anyone else, for two reasons: first, because the rhetorical manuals did not contain it; and, second, because the discussion of style as it developed during the period of Caesar's authorship was concerned primarily with establishing the superiority of a particular style as such, and not with the suitability of one kind or another for a special purpose.

With this much as a background, we may now turn to a more detailed examination of Caesar's language and manner of writing.

It is generally recognized that the first book of the Gallic War occupies a position somewhat apart from the rest, both in its character and in its language. It has been noted that such full expressions as *propterea quod*, the repetition of the antecedent (*itinera duo, quibus itineribus*), and pleonasms like *permitteret ut eius voluntate liceret* are much more common in this book than in those that follow.<sup>9</sup> This is true also of causal *quod*, especially with an antecedent *eo* or *hoc*, of the substantive *quod*-clause, and of such specific transitional phrases as *his rebus adducti*.

All of these are expressions of greater precision and explicitness than those ordinarily employed for the same purpose. They have a contentious and legalistic<sup>10</sup> air about them that is better suited to the advocate than to the historian. The beginning of the war did actually call for a justification and defense of Caesar's aggressive policy, which was no longer necessary after the war was in progress and clearly

<sup>9</sup> Frese, *Beitr. z. Beurteilung d. Spr. Caesars*, pp. 22 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Thielmann, *De sermonis proprietatibus*, pp. 25 ff.; Parzinger, *Beitr. z. Kenntnis d. Entw. d. cic. Stils*, p. 83.

successful.<sup>11</sup> The defensive character of the book appears not only in Caesar's careful and accurate language but in the frequent assignment of the reasons for his action and in the very full account of his diplomatic sparring with Ariovistus. It is a book of argument as much as it is a book of war and conquest. But, quite apart from its purpose, if Caesar's style changes and develops as he proceeds, we should expect it to be less well adapted, at first, to its particular task of narration. This does not mean that the writing as such is less perfect in the beginning, for the first book is one of the most carefully finished of them all. In one of its aspects this change in Caesar's style was but a participation in a general change. The various precise forms of speech which we have mentioned are found rather widely used also in the *Auctor ad Herennium* and in Cicero's *De inventione* and his early speeches.<sup>12</sup> The point worth noting in the case of Caesar is that he still employed them quite extensively after they had largely passed out of general use.

With the second book Caesar falls more definitely into the narrative stride, and, as this book and the next two have much in common, we may think of them as a unit. For one thing, the sentences in the narrative portions of these three books are noticeably longer than in any of the others. The average number of sentences per one hundred lines runs as follows: *BG* i. 24. 6; ii-iv. 21. 6; v-vii. 26. 3; *BC* i-ii. 30. 3; iii. 25. 4.

Almost exactly corresponding to this difference is a change in the periodic narrative sentence of which we have already spoken.<sup>13</sup> In Books ii-iv this form of sentence experienced an intensive development. There is a sharp rise in the number of subordinate clauses and phrases which precede the dominant verb. The percentage of such verbs when they are preceded by two or more of these in the narrative portions of the individual books is as follows:

<i>BG</i> i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii
20. 5	49. 1	45. 9	38. 5	29. 1	26. 6	29. 3
<i>BC</i> i	ii	iii				
22. 3	25. 9	34. 5				

<sup>11</sup> A detailed account is given in Ebert, *Über d. Entstehung v. Caesars "Bellum Gallicum,"* pp. 21-48.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Thielmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff., 24 ff.; Frese, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 23-24; Parzinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 83 ff.

<sup>13</sup> On p. 212.

The abrupt change after Book i is especially striking. Book i, in line with the more conservative character of its language, exhibits a trait in its narrative which is elsewhere characteristic of the speeches, namely, the simpler, undifferentiated form of the periodic sentence. The high mark in the other direction is reached in Books ii and iii. There is some recession in iv, and in v there is a drop to what, with some variations, remains the norm throughout the remainder of the Gallic War. The lengths to which this practice sometimes went may be seen in a sentence like the following:

His nuntiis acceptis, Galba, cum neque opus hibernorum munitionesque plene essent perfectae neque de frumento satis esset provisum, quod deditione facta obsidibusque acceptis nihil de bello timendum existimaverat, consilio celeriter convocato, sententias exquirere coepit [BG iii. 3].

In the Civil War the situation is rather different. Here the low percentage of dominant verbs preceded by two or more subordinate clauses or phrases in Books i and ii is probably due to the greater brevity and simplicity of the sentences, which average 30.3 per 100 lines. This fact and the general absence of conjunctions and transitional phrases in the early chapters of Book i produce that impression of haste and nervous excitement for which they are noted. It may be, however, in view of the admittedly less finished state of the Civil War, that we have in it something more like a *commentarius in the rough*, rather than a literary one, as in the Gallic War.<sup>14</sup> This view is supported by other peculiarities of these two books, to be mentioned later. Neither of them contains any mention of valiant deeds performed by individual soldiers, and Book i has no speeches in direct discourse, though both of these features are found in the other books, beginning with BG iv.

Of the three forms of subordination used in the sentences under discussion—the subordinate clause, temporal or circumstantial, the ablative absolute, and the participial phrase—there is throughout a decided, though uneven, decline in the first, and a similar increase in the last. The ablative absolute, while varying from book to book, maintains a fairly even frequency. The accompanying table shows the percentage for each of the constructions in the different books. It will be seen that the permanent losses to the subordinate clause begin with

<sup>14</sup> Cicero *Brut.* 262.

*BG* ii and again with *BG* vi, and the permanent gains to the participial phrase with *BG* iv and *BC* i. Usually, when either of these two is exceptionally high in any book the ablative absolute will be low, and vice versa.

<i>BG</i> . . . . .	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii
Sub. cl. . . . .	37. 4	32. 2	30. 4	23. 7	30. 3	15. 6	21. 4
Abl. abs. . . . .	38. 9	42.	52.	48. 4	43.	54. 9	47. 2
Ppl. . . . .	23. 7	25. 9	17. 6	28. 1	26. 7	29. 5	31. 4
<i>BC</i> . . . . .	i	ii	iii				
Sub. cl. . . . .	17. 5	15.	19. 6				
Abl. abs. . . . .	44. 8	39. 2	40. 7				
Ppl. . . . .	37. 7	45. 8	39. 7				

Now, both of the major changes whose course we have just observed—the retreat from the overloaded periodic sentences of Books ii–iv and the increasing substitution of the participial phrase for the subordinate clause—were movements in the direction of the even flow which Cicero speaks of as a characteristic of the historical style. For the periodic sentence acts like a dam in the stream, and more so the higher it is. And, on their part, the purely ancillary and in themselves non-assertive participial phrases offer less obstruction to the even flow of the sentence than the more self-sufficient subordinate clause or even the ablative absolute, with its own subject and predicate elements.

It is interesting to observe, further, the introduction, after Book iv, of several other changes closely associated with the foregoing, which, like them, indicate a shift in the direction of greater smoothness of movement. An established habit like that of the periodic sentence could of course not be changed overnight. But something might be done by breaking it up into smaller units and distributing these more evenly throughout the sentence. Instead of loading many subordinate clauses and phrases upon one main verb, which was such a characteristic feature of *BG* ii–iv, a second (co-ordinate) verb might be made to carry one or more of them. The sentence would then appear as follows:

Cavarinum publico consilio interficere conati, cum ille praesensisset ac profugisset, usque ad fines insecuri regno domoque expulerunt, et, missis ad Caesarem legatis, cum is omnem ad se senatum venire iussisset, dicto audi- dientes non fuerunt [*BG* v. 54].

The extent to which this happened is not very great (there are only about 265 cases in all Caesar), but it is worth noting that there was a decided increase after Book iv, followed by a gradual decline and another rise between *BC* i and iii. The figures (reduced to a common denominator to eliminate the disparity in the length of the books) are as follows:<sup>15</sup>

<i>BG</i>	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii
	13. 3	17. 3	16. 4	17. 9	33. 3	27. 8	23. 8
<i>BC</i>	i	ii	iii				
	20. 6	24. 9	40				

A second means of more even distribution, which flew directly in the face of the periodic sentence, was that of placing the participial phrase or ablative absolute not before, but after, the dominant verb: "De tertia vigilia ad hostes contendit, eo minus veritus navibus quod in litore molli atque aperto deligatas ad ancoras relinquebat" (*BG* v. 9).

Of this practice, which later became such a prominent stylistic feature in the historians,<sup>16</sup> we find only faint beginnings in the first four books of the Gallic War. Only one example (*BG* iv. 10) shows the construction conspicuously displayed, as it generally appears from *BG* v onward. The other examples in Books i-iv are hidden away in subordinate clauses or appositional expressions. The total number of occurrences is as follows:

<i>BG</i>	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	<i>BC</i>	i	ii	iii
	2	1	2	5	14	9	16		23	8	29

As in other changes which we have noticed, there is a small beginning in Book iv, and a full acceptance in Book v. Some of the sentences contain more than one added phrase, so that the total number of these is ablative absolute, 71; participial phrase, 69. The movement toward a fuller use of the latter, which we have observed before, is evident here also: ablative absolute (*BG* 44; *BC* 27); participial phrase (*BG* 34; *BC* 35). Of the 107 occurrences of the construction, 15 are in indirect discourse.

Two other constructions which would also have helped to make the sentence flow more smoothly are not used by Caesar with any increase

<sup>15</sup> Only co-ordinate verbs or clauses joined by "and" are included.

<sup>16</sup> I have traced the history of this construction in *CP*, XXVIII, 296 ff.

of frequency. One is the continuing relative clause loosely attached after a dominant verb, of which the Gallic War has 153 cases in its narrative parts and the Civil War 130.<sup>17</sup> The other (but little used by Caesar) is the loosely attached circumstantial *cum*-clause, of which each work has about a dozen.

On the other hand, the initial relative (referring back to the preceding sentence) shows a considerable increase in the Civil War, which has 139 instances in the narrative parts, as compared with 118 in the Gallic War, although the latter has about 22 per cent more narrative than the former. Only 16 cases occur outside of the narrative in all of Caesar. Initial "and," although it is used less often, is also found more frequently in the Civil War (50 times; in the Gallic War 30 times). All but three of these cases are found in narrative. The distribution is, in the Gallic War: *atque* 19, *neque* 7, *-que* 4; in the Civil War: *atque* 10, *neque* 16, *-que* 19, *et* 5. Initial *et* is found only in *BC* iii, which alone contains 36 of the total of 80 cases. There is none in *BG* i.<sup>18</sup>

The word "and" is important in narrative in so far as the purpose of the latter is merely to present what happened, free from interpretation or explanation, for it is the most noncommittal of all conjunctions. But it is especially important as an evidence of development in an author like Caesar, who brought to the task of narration the habit of argumentation and *ex parte* statement natural to a man in public life. And we find that its use increases in the course of his writing, not only at the beginning of the sentence but elsewhere. On the basis of the figures by Dernoschek,<sup>19</sup> the three forms of "and" (*et*, *atque*, *-que*) occur 2,381 times in *BG* (35.1 per 100 lines) and 1,946 times in *BC* (39.2 per 100 lines). It should be noted, further, that *-que*, which certainly contributes more to the smooth flow of the sentence than the other two, also increases at their expense. It makes up 37 per cent of the total in *BG* and 42.6 per cent in *BC*.

<sup>17</sup> The discrepancy between these figures and those given by Menge (*D. Relativum in d. Sprache Caesars*, p. 16) is probably due to the fact that my figures are only for the narrative parts and that I have included only those relative clauses which were added when the sentence was formally complete, not those loosely added to a part of the sentence which required something further to complete its meaning.

<sup>18</sup> The figures for the different books are: *BG* 0-3-3-3-8-8-3; *BC* 7-6-36.

<sup>19</sup> *De elegantia Caesaris*, p. 40. The figures are totals, no distinction being made between the narrative part and the rest.

To summarize, the development of sentence construction in Caesar's narrative has been as follows: After *BG* i, which, with its overprecise and argumentative manner and its rather old-fashioned mode of expression, has not yet adapted itself fully to a narrative technique, the first phase (*BG* ii–iv)<sup>20</sup> represents an intensification of the periodical narrative sentence by overloading it with preliminary detail. Relief from this extreme was found in various ways, from *BG* v onward—first, by distributing some of the load carried by a single main verb among several verbs of the sentence; second, by increasing the use of such elements in the sentence as afford an easy transition—namely, the ablative absolute and the participial phrase—and diminishing the number of the more stubborn and specific subordinate clauses; third, by placing some of these, especially the participial constructions, after the dominant verb instead of before it; fourth, by increasing the use of nonecommittal words of easy transition, both at the beginning of the sentence and within it. Some of these changes progressed quite steadily from the beginning to the end, while others appeared more spasmodically, and still others did not manifest themselves decisively before the Civil War.

The point at which the cumulative effect of these changes began to be distinctly felt was Book v of the Gallic War (though a few first appeared prominently in Book iv or Book vi). As we have said, their operation tended to undermine the periodic sentence and to bring the movement of the sentence nearer to Cicero's requirement of an even flow. Whether his definition of the historical style in the *De oratore* had anything directly to do with the changes in Caesar's narrative at that point, or whether the coincidence in time was purely accidental and they were both born of a movement which was already under way, and well advanced not long afterward, as we see in Nepos and Sallust,<sup>21</sup> we need not try to decide. But it is certainly significant that they came at a point in Caesar's account when various other changes also appeared in it, and of quite a different sort.

One of these is the introduction of speeches in direct discourse. It occurs for the first time near the end of Book iv (chap. 25). After

<sup>20</sup> An interval between the composition of Books iv and v or iv and vi has been assumed or suggested on other grounds besides those mentioned here (*Jahresberichte*, CCXIV, 159 and 168).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *CP*, XXVIII, 297.

that each book, except *BC* i, contains two or more instances of it (altogether twelve passages in *BG* and twelve in *BC*).<sup>22</sup> They occur nearly always when the situation is exciting and dramatic. It is noteworthy that only subordinate officers, centurions and others of low rank, are at first distinguished in this way—in *BG* vii the Gallic leaders also. In the Civil War, Pompey speaks twice in direct discourse and Caesar once. Three of the speeches are full length (*BG* 77, Critognatus, and *BC* ii. 31 and 32, Curio), but several of those near the end of *BC* iii also are noticeably longer than the rest.

Closely connected with the introduction of direct discourse is the notice taken of heroism and daring on the part of individual men of low rank in the army. No mention is made of the exceptional conduct of such men until we reach the fourth book of the Gallic War. But from then on each book contains one or more heroes of this class: in Book iv, Piso the Aquitanian (12) and an unnamed standard-bearer (25); in v, Lucanius (35), Petrosidius (37), Pullo and Vorenus (44); in vi, Baculus (38); in vii, a long succession of Gauls (25), Fabius (47), Petronius (50). They are less common in the Civil War, although here also there are two examples: Scaeva (iii. 53) and Crastinus (iii. 91 and 95).

The rather extended descriptive passages dealing with the Suebi (*BG* iv. 1-3), Britain (*BG* v. 12-14), and the customs of Gauls and Germans (*BG* vi. 11-28) are another new feature first introduced in Book iv. Unlike those mentioned above, however, they do not occur after *BG* vi. But beginning in Book v we find extended descriptions of a different sort, namely, vivid and detailed accounts of tense and dramatic situations. Such are the attack on the camp of Sabinus and Cotta, with its fateful council meeting (*BG* v. 26-37), the attack on Cicero's camp and the fire (v. 40-48), the senate meetings which precede the crossing of the Rubicon (*BC* i. 1-6), the surrender of Corfinium (*BC* i. 19-23), the fraternization between the armies in Spain (*BC* i. 74-76), the treachery and surrender of the Massilians (*BC* ii. 11-16), the situation in Curio's camp (*BC* ii. 27-33), the end of Caelius and Milo (*BC* iii. 20-23), the taxes and exactions of Pompey (*BC* iii. 31-33), the scarcity of food in Caesar's army (*BC* iii. 47-49), the mis-

<sup>22</sup> *BG* iv. 25; v. 30 and 44; vi. 8 and 35; vii. 20 (2), 38 (2), 50 (2), and 77; *BC* ii. 31, 32, 34, and 39; iii. 18, 19, 64, 85, 86, 87, 91, and 94.

conduct and desertion of the sons of Abducillus (*BC* iii. 59–61), and many others, more briefly told, which would have been mentioned only in passing, if at all, in the first four books of the Gallic War.

In these new features we seem to see the transformation of a strictly professional account of warfare, in which only the army and its achievements in the mass and the general's strategy are important, into something like a history—there is even a chapter devoted to prodigies (*BC* iii. 105)—which would attract the general reader. As we have seen, the change first appears, to some extent, in *BG* iv, but more fully in *BG* v, and it continues with varying stress from there on to the end of the Civil War. It was, we may assume, connected in some way with the expeditions into Britain. The romantic glamor of this undertaking, with its promise of adventure if not gain, attracted an exceptionally large company of eager young men to Caesar's headquarters—*in tanta multitudine eorum qui una essent*, says Cicero, quoting Trebatius (*Q. Fr.* ii. 15. 3). Presently it began to interest Quintus Cicero, who was with Caesar on the second expedition, as a subject for an epic poem, and before long Marcus was himself enthusiastic about it. *Quos tu situs*, he exclaims, *quas naturas rerum et locorum, quos mores, quas gentes, quas pugnas, quem vero ipsum imperatorem habes!*<sup>23</sup> The project was discussed repeatedly in the correspondence between the brothers during the summer and fall of 54. Finally, after some urging, Marcus undertook to write the poem.<sup>24</sup> Quintus saw to it that the news came to Caesar's ears,<sup>25</sup> and, finally, it was finished in December.<sup>26</sup> Cicero was well pleased with it, and we may assume that he sent it to Caesar, especially as the latter knew that it was being written. But we hear nothing more of it, and since there is no reference to it outside of the letters to Quintus, it may never have been published. However, the great interest which the expeditions aroused, to say nothing of the poem itself, might very naturally lead Caesar to make something more of his account than the professional report which we have in the earlier books of the Gallic War.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

<sup>23</sup> *Q. Fr.* ii. 16. 4.

<sup>24</sup> ii. 15. 2.

<sup>25</sup> iii. 8. 3.

<sup>26</sup> iii. 9. 6.

## THE POEMS OF ARCHIAS IN THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY

HELEN H. LAW

THE need for further study of the epigrams of Archias in the *Greek Anthology* was pointed out by Stadtmüller in his review of Reinach's *De Archia poeta*.<sup>1</sup> The problem briefly stated is this: Aside from ten poems of which the authorship is doubtful,<sup>2</sup> there are twenty-one poems in the *Greek Anthology* marked merely 'Αρχίον,<sup>3</sup> four assigned to 'Αρχίον Μυτιληναῖον (vii. 696; ix. 19, 111, 339), one to 'Αρχίον Μακεδόνος (vii. 140), one to 'Αρχίον Βυζαντίου (vii. 278), two to 'Αρχίον νεωτέρον (ix. 91; x. 10), and one, probably, to 'Αρχίον γραμματικοῦ (vi. 195).<sup>4</sup> In addition, we know from Cicero (*De divin.* i. 79) that his friend, Archias of Antioch, wrote verses that may very well have been included in the *Anthology*. The question rises as to whether it is possible to decide how many poets of the name of Archias are to be found in the *Greek Anthology* and which poems may with the greatest degree of probability be assigned to each poet. Since there is no reference in the poems to external events or contemporaries, the decision must be based on a consideration of their probable position in the collections of Meleager or Philippus, their relation to other poets and a study of their style, including meter and diction.

Paton's references to Archias in the Loeb translation of the *Greek Anthology* show that previous study of the poems has left the matter still in doubt.<sup>5</sup> In the Index of Volume I we find, after the name of

<sup>1</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, XI (1891), 913–17.

<sup>2</sup> v. 98: 'Ἄδηλον οἱ δὲ 'Αρχίον; vii. 165: τοῦ ἀβροῦ (Antipater of Sidon) οἱ δὲ 'Αρχίον (probably Stadtmüller is right in assigning this to Antipater) and 164 on the same theme to Archias; see p. 235); ix. 27: 'Αρχίον οἱ δὲ Παρμενώνος; ix. 64: 'Ασκληπιάδον οἱ δὲ 'Αρχίον; xvi. 154: Λονκάνον οἱ δὲ 'Αρχίον. Planudes also gives to Archias ix. 345, 346, 347, 348, 351, which the *Palatine Anthology* gives more plausibly to Leonidas of Alexandria (see p. 240).

<sup>3</sup> v. 58, 59; vi. 16, 39, 179–81, 192, 207; vii. 68, 147, 191, 213, 214; ix. 343, 750; x. 7, 8; xv. 51; xvi. 94, 179.

<sup>4</sup> vi. 195, an epigram on a trumpet. The lemma 'Αρχίον γραμματικοῦ' on vi. 194 ('Ἀδέσποτον'), which is also on a trumpet, is the evidence for assigning vi. 195 to Archias the grammarian.

<sup>5</sup> W. R. Paton, *The Greek Anthology with an English Translation* (New York, 1916–18).  
[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, XXXI, July, 1936]

Archias, "possibly second of this name," and in Volume II "There were, it seems, two of this name." In Volume III Archias of Antioch is distinguished from Archias of Mytilene, although all the poems attributed to him are marked with a question mark except ix. 91, which has the lemma *'Αρχίον νεωτέρου*. In Volume IV, however, a poem with the same lemma is given to Archias the Younger, while x. 7 and 8 are assigned to another Archias with the statement: "This may be the poet defended by Cicero." In Volume V, after the name of Archias we find only "There were several." In contrast to the uncertainty of Paton, Waltz<sup>6</sup> attributes to Archias of Antioch all the poems of the fifth and sixth books without any indication to the reader that there is any doubt about the matter and that actually not a single poem in the *Anthology* is explicitly designated as his.

As early as 1869 Haupt<sup>7</sup> expressed the view that since certain epigrams are assigned to Archias of Macedon, Archias of Mytilene, etc., it is probable that the epigrams given to Archias without any descriptive adjective were written by the famous Archias—Archias of Antioch. The weakness of this logic is seen if we apply the same criterion to the poems of other poets of the *Anthology*. It would be necessary to attribute, for instance, to Alcaeus of Lesbos and Leonidas of Tarentum, as the more famous poets of those names, poems marked merely *'Αλκαῖον* or *Λεωνίδα*, which the contents or form show clearly were written by Alcaeus of Messene or Leonidas of Alexandria (for instance, ix. 588; xi. 9). It is not the practice in the *Greek Anthology* to distinguish by adjectives of this sort the more obscure poets from the more famous ones. In many cases the adjective has apparently simply dropped out of the lemma. For example, the large number of epigrams marked simply Antipater, which may be by either Antipater of Sidon or Antipater of Thessalonica, may be noted. Haupt goes on to say that, at any rate, he sees nothing in the poems that makes it impossible for them to have been written by a contemporary of

<sup>6</sup> P. Waltz, *Anthologia Graeca*. ([Paris] Vols. I, II [Books i-v] [1928]; Vol. III [Book vi] [1931]), II, 141; III, 184.

<sup>7</sup> "Analecta," *Hermes*, III (1869), 206-7. He attributes to Archias of Antioch all the epigrams marked simply *'Αρχίον* except xv. 51, which he ignores. Jacobs (*Anthologia Graeca* [Leipzig, 1814], XIII, 859) quotes Ilgen as saying that all these poems should be given to Archias of Antioch, but Jacobs himself expresses his doubt, asking whether if there were a third Antipater all the poems not expressly attributed to Antipater of Sidon or Antipater of Thessalonica would be given to him.

Cicero. This is true, but it is also true that there is nothing in the poems which makes it impossible for them to have been written a generation before Cicero or a century after him. He sees additional evidence in the fact that four of the poems (vi. 16, 179–81) are variations of the same theme, since this is consistent with what Cicero says about Archias' skill in improvising variations on the same subject.

Quoties ego hunc vidi, cum litteram scripsisset nullam, magnum numerum optimorum versuum de eis ipsis rebus, quae tum agerentur, dicere ex tempore! Quoties revocatum eandem rem commutatis verbis atque sententiis [Pro Archia, 8]!

But since Cicero says the same thing of Antipater of Sidon (*De orat.* iii. 194), this skill was not peculiar to Archias. There are other examples of the same facility in the *Anthology*. Doublets on the same theme are not uncommon, and Zosimus of Thasos, whose poems were probably included in the collection of Meleager, has four epigrams on the same subject (vi. 15[?], 183–85). We may conclude that such ability was highly prized at this time and not rare.

Hillscher<sup>8</sup> thinks that Haupt is right in giving these epigrams to Archias of Antioch. Reinach<sup>9</sup> takes practically the same view as Haupt. He assigns definitely and without question to Archias of Antioch all the twenty-one epigrams marked simply 'Αρχίον. His arguments are, in the main, those of Haupt, but in addition the heroic character of what he considers the best epigrams suggests to him that their author had probably written epic, as we know Archias of Antioch had.

Stadtmüller showed in 1891 (*op. cit.*) that he was not satisfied with Reinach's treatment of the epigrams of Archias. His own conclusions may be seen in part in his edition of the *Greek Anthology*, unfortunately only brought through ix. 563 at the time of his death.<sup>10</sup> In I, xx, he marks the poems of Archias in Book vi as *Antiochensis* with a question mark. In II, ix, he points out that the Μακεδόνος with 'Αρχίον in the lemma of vii. 140 may have come in by mistake from the preceding

<sup>8</sup> A. Hillscher, *Jahr. f. class. phil. Suppl.*, XVII (1892), 402–3.

<sup>9</sup> T. Reinach, *De Archia poeta* (Paris, 1890), 33–35.

<sup>10</sup> *Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea* ([Leipzig], Vol. I [1894]; Vol. II [1899]; Vol. III [1906]).

lemma: *eis τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ eis Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Μακεδόνα*. This is logical, for it is almost too much of a coincidence that there should be a poem on Hector by Archias of Macedonia immediately following a poem on Hector and Alexander of Macedonia. Since there is no other evidence for an Archias of Macedonia, I think that Stadtmüller is right in his view that no such poet ever existed and that he appears in the *Anthology* only through the error of a careless copyist.

Stadtmüller's treatment of Archias of Byzantium is not so satisfactory. He thinks that vii. 279 ("Αδηλον") is by Antiphilus of Byzantium (II, lxxvii). His evidence, certain similarities in language and style between this poem and the poems of Antiphilus, is not convincing; and to use as additional proof the *Bυζαντίου* of the lemma of vii. 278, supposing that it is part of the missing lemma of 279, is illogical. In other words, no real reason to doubt the existence of Archias of Byzantium has been shown.

Stadtmüller would assign vii. 191, 213, 214 to Archias of Mytilene, if the two poets, Archias of Antioch and Archias of Mytilene, are to be distinguished (II, xix). On the other hand, he thinks it possible though not probable that the adjectives *Bυζαντίου* and *Μυτιληναῖον* may indicate not the birthplace of the poet but *variam peregrinantis sedem*, and that the poems may all be by the same author, Archias of Antioch, since the epigrams themselves do not show a diversity of authorship either in their place in Cephalus or in their style and contents. But we have no evidence that these adjectives formed from the name of places were ever used for anything except the name of the birthplace of a poet or that, even if they were, Archias was ever in either Byzantium or Mytilene for any length of time. Consequently, this simple solution of the problem seems not only improbable but impossible.

The first point to consider is whether or not we can place any of these epigrams in the collections of Meleager or Philippus. Reinach thinks that it is impossible to do so (*op. cit.*, p. 34). Stadtmüller (*BPW*, XI, 914) points out that ix. 91 ('Αρχίου νεωτέρον) is, according to Weiss häupl,<sup>11</sup> a part of the stephanos of Philippus and vii. 164 (see above) part of the stephanos of Meleager.<sup>12</sup> In addition, as

<sup>11</sup> R. Weiss häupl, *Die Grabgedichte der griechischen Anthologie* (Vienna, 1889), p. 17.

<sup>12</sup> A. Menk (*De Anthologiae Palatinae epigrammatis sepulchralibus* [Marburg, 1884], p. 3) puts vii. 68 also in a fragment from the Meleager stephanos, but as he is using as

Stadtmüller shows, several of the poems come either at the beginning or end of sections from one of these collections and may belong to them. The poems preceding or following a section of Meleager, according to Weisshäupl, are v. 58, 59; vi. 16, 207; vii. 191, 213, 214—all marked simply *'Αρχίον*. None marked in the same way has a similar place in the stephanos of Philippus. Although this sort of evidence must be used with care, we may draw the conclusion that there was in all probability at least one Archias in the stephanos of Philippus and at least one Archias in that of Meleager. The fact that the Archias of Philippus is called *νεώτερος* suggests, of course, that Philippus knew an older poet of that name whose epigrams would presumably be in the collection of Meleager and would be additional evidence for that fact.

One may ask whether the poems of Archias of Antioch would have been in the collection of Meleager or of Philippus, if they had been included in one of them. The date of Meleager's stephanos is not known exactly, but a scholiast on the *Palatine Anthology* says that he flourished under the last Seleucid (95–93 B.C.). He included the poems of Antipater of Sidon, an older contemporary of Archias, but that Antipater was dead at the time is shown by the fact that Meleager wrote a sepulchral epigram for him (vii. 428). One gathers from the way in which Cicero speaks of Antipater in *De oratore*, the dramatic date of which is 91 B.C., that he is supposed to be dead at this time. We may, then, date the collection of Meleager soon after 90 B.C., certainly, at any rate, before 80. Archias must have been considerably under twenty when he came to Rome in 102 B.C., as Cicero speaks of him, probably with some exaggeration, as *praetextatus* at that time (*Pro Archia* 5) and he was still a comparatively young man when Meleager was making his collection. At any rate, Archias was still living and writing in 62 when Cicero defended him and in 61 when Cicero referred to him in a letter (*Ad Att.* i. 16. 15). It is quite probable that Meleager included the poems of no living poets beside him-

his criterion in assigning certain epigrams to Meleager the alphabetical arrangement of the poems, too much weight must not be given to his opinion. In spite of the testimony of the scholiast, the most generally accepted view of the present time is that the arrangement of the poems in the collection of Meleager was not alphabetical as it was in Philippus. Cf. Geffcken, in Pauly-Wissowa, XV, 482, 483; A. Wifstrand, *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 6; Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur bearbeitet von Schmid* (6th ed.; Munich, 1920), II, 327.

self in his stephanos, a convenient criterion. We know that the epigrams of Philodemus, who flourished about 60 B.C., were not included in Meleager's collection. We must conclude, then, that the poems of Archias of Antioch, if they were included in either collection, were in that of Philippus and not in that of Meleager.<sup>13</sup>

That Archias of Antioch wrote epigrams (*De divin.* i. 79)<sup>14</sup> and that he had a considerable reputation as a poet (*Pro Archia, passim*) is known from Cicero, although we cannot take at its face value everything that Cicero says about his poetic genius. The fact that none of the epigrams coming down to us under the name of Archias shows any great poetic distinction is not in itself evidence that they were not written by him. Cicero would be inclined to exaggerate the merit of a poet who was a personal friend and who had promised to write a poem on his consulship, and, in any case, it was his ability as an epic poet dealing with Roman themes that would be taken seriously. But, at any rate, he was well-enough known so that it seems improbable that he would have been ignored by a person who was collecting the epigrams of the period, if such Greek poets living in Rome as Philodemus and Crinagoras were included. We may, I think, safely assume that the poems of Archias of Antioch were included in the collection of Philippus and that there were, at least, three poets of the name of Archias in the *Greek Anthology*: Archias of Byzantium, Archias of Mytilene, and Archias of Antioch, agreeing with Stadtmüller in eliminating Archias of Macedonia. The younger Archias and Archias the grammarian may be identical with some one of these. All that we know of the epigrams of Archias of Antioch from Cicero is that he could improvise variations on the same theme (*Pro Arch.* 8) and that he wrote at least one poem on a work of art (*De divin.* i. 79). But this does not help us very much since skill in varying a theme was

<sup>13</sup> Opinion on this matter is divided. Reitzenstein (in Pauly-Wissowa, II, 463) puts the poems of Archias of Antioch in the collection of Meleager. Christ-Schmid (*op. cit.*, II, 322) thinks that they may have been in that collection. Knaack (F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur der Alexanderzeit* [Leipzig, 1892], II, 699) expresses his doubt that the poems of this Archias were in the collection of Meleager. Croiset puts the poems of Archias of Antioch with those of Philodemus in the collection of Philippus (*Histoire de la littérature grecque* [Paris, 1899], V, 258).

<sup>14</sup> It is difficult to see how these verses, describing a work of art, can have been anything but an epigram, although Cicero does not use this word. At any rate, this passage has been generally used as evidence that Archias wrote epigrams (cf., e.g., Susemihl, *op. cit.*, II, 560).

not uncommon (see above) and no subject for an epigram was more popular from Hellenistic times on than a work of art. Let us see, then, whether by a comparative study of the poems of Archias in the *Greek Anthology* we can find any distinguishing characteristics that will be helpful in settling this question.

The first point to be considered is the relation of these poems of the poets called Archias to those of earlier poets. There is a group of poems that show clearly the influence of Anyte and her school. One of the favorite subjects of the poets of this school was epitaphs on dead animals.<sup>15</sup> The poem on the dolphin cast up on the shore (vii. 214) is an imitation of a poem of Anyte on the same subject (vii. 215). The poems on the cicada (vii. 213), on the magpie (vii. 191), and on the race horse (ix. 19) show the influence of this school of poetry. Aside from the theme and general sentiment, one may note the following verbal resemblances. *ἀ πάρος . . . νῦν* (vii. 191. 1 and 5), *πρὶν μὲν . . . νῦν δὲ* (vii. 213. 1 and 5), *δὸ πρὶν . . . νῦν* (ix. 19. 1, 7) may all be compared with *πρόσθε μὲν . . . νῦν δὲ* (Simias vi. 113). The expression *οὐκέτι . . . οὐδὲ . . . οὐδὲ . . . ἢ γὰρ* (vii. 214. 1, 3, 5, 7) is frequently used by the poets of this school. Compare, for instance, Anyte vii. 202. 1, 3 and vii. 215. 1, 3, 5; Simias vii. 203. 1, 4; Mnasalcas vii. 192. 1, 3 and Aristodiceus of Rhodes vii. 189. 1, 5.<sup>16</sup> In addition, the beginning of vii. 213, *πρὶν μὲν ἐπὶ χλωροῦς ἐριθηλέος ἔρνεσι πεύκας ἡμενός*, may be compared with *ἐπὶ χλωρῶν ἐξόμενον πετάλων* (Nicias vii. 200. 3) and *οὐκέτι δὴ χλωροῦσιν ἐφεξόμενος πετάλοισιν* (Pamphilus vii. 201. 1).<sup>17</sup> One may note other points of resemblance in vocabulary: *ἀχέτα . . . τέττιξ* (vii. 213. 3, 4) and *ἡχέτα . . . τέττιξ* (Pamphilus vii. 201. 3); *κρέξασα* (vii. 191. 3), *ἔκρεκες* (vii. 213. 3), and *κρέκονσα* (Mnasalcas vii. 192. 4); *ἄγλωσσος* (vii. 191. 5) and *ἀγλώσσον* (Simias vii. 193. 4). To this group of poems may be added vii. 696 (Archias of Mytilene).<sup>18</sup> Aside from its pastoral atmosphere,

<sup>15</sup> G. Herrlinger, "Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung," *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, VIII (1930), 13, 67–69.

<sup>16</sup> This form of expression is not limited, of course, to poets of this school. It is found also in Leonidas of Tarentum, who shows in some poems the influence of these poets (vii. 740) and in Antipater of Sidon (vi. 115; vii. 8). But in none of these cases is the parallel as close as in the passages cited from Anyte and her school.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. also Meleager vii. 196. 3.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Alcaeus of Messene xvi. 8 on the same subject with striking verbal parallels.

a relation to the poems of this school is suggested by the phrase οὐκέτι . . . ὡς πάρος and the phrase ἐκ λασίας πίτνος, with which may be compared ἀκροκόμου πίτνος in the same position in the verse (vii. 213. 2).

We may conclude, then, that vii. 191, 213, 214, 696 and ix. 19 are by the same poet. Since two of these poems, ix. 19 and vii. 696, are by Archias of Mytilene, we must consider next the two other poems with the same lemma. One of these, ix. 111, is a moralizing poem based on a well-known passage of Herodotus about the Thracians (v. 4). The phrase ἀπροϊδῆς Κηρῶν λάτρις ἔμαρψε Μόρος (iii. 4) may be compared with "Αἴδος ἀπροϊδῆς ἀμφεκάλυψε μυχός (vii. 213. 6). The word ἀπροϊδῆς does not occur in any other poem in the *Anthology* and appears elsewhere in Greek literature only in Nicander. The other poem, ix. 339, has as its theme the story of a raven which, when it attacked a scorpion, was killed by its sting. There is nothing in its theme, except that it concerns animals, that suggests any other poem of this group. It belongs instead to a group of poems using incidents from animal life to point a moral in the manner of Aesop's *Fables*. It was apparently a popular subject, especially in the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. The sententious ending of ix. 339, however, is not unlike the moralizing of ix. 111. One may also compare the μάρψων of ix. 339. 3 with ἔμαρψε (ix. 111. 4) and μάρψεν (Nicias vii. 200. 4), with which we have also compared vii. 213. With ix. 339 must be compared ix. 343, which uses the same sort of theme. It tells the story of a blackbird and a thrush caught in a net, and its moralizing close reminds us of ix. 111 and the ending of ix. 339. This epigram imitates, though not very closely, an epigram of Antipater of Sidon on the same subject (ix. 76).

I would assign, then, to Archias of Mytilene not only the four poems which have his name in the lemma—vii. 696; ix. 19, 111, 339—but also vii. 191, 213, 214 and ix. 343.<sup>19</sup> I am inclined to think that the epigrams of Archias of Mytilene were in the stephanos of Meleager

<sup>19</sup> Stadtmüller (*op. cit.*, II, xix) would be inclined to give to Archias of Mytilene vii. 191, 213, 214. Reinach and Waltz assign all these poems marked 'Αρχίας to Archias of Antioch (*op. cit.*). Menk gives to Archias of Mytilene vii. 68 as well as vii. 191, 213, and 214. He thinks that no epigram can be attributed to Archias of Antioch, and since he believes that the poems of Archias of Byzantium were in the collection of Philippus, he assigns to Archias of Mytilene all poems of Archias which appear to have been in the stephanos of Meleager (*op. cit.*, pp. 48–49).

since vii. 191, 213, 214 and ix. 339 precede or follow a section from Meleager's collection, according to Weisshäupl (*op. cit.*, p. 10). The first three Menk also puts in a fragment from the Meleager collection (*op. cit.*, p. 4; but see n. 12). To be sure, ix. 111 comes between two sections from Philippus and vii. 696 is separated only by an anonymous poem from another section of Philippus, but neither of these comes in a section where the alphabetical arrangement of the poems can be seen. In fact, the alphabetical arrangement, indisputable in the stephanos of Philippus in contrast to that of Meleager, is against their position in the Philippus collection, for a series of poems beginning Α, Γ, Γ, Η, Ο precedes vii. 696, which begins with Α and ix. 111 beginning with Θ directly follows an epigram beginning with Ο.

In general, the vocabulary of these poems is simple as it is in those of Anyte and her school, and the style does not show the straining for effect that we get sometimes elsewhere. Newly coined words and long compounds are comparatively rare.<sup>20</sup> As far as meter is concerned,<sup>21</sup> it may be noted that two of the three cases in the epigrams under discussion in which a bucolic caesura follows a spondee in the fourth foot are found in vii. 213. 7 and vii. 214. 7. Trochaic hiatus is avoided by this poet, and there is only one case of dactylic hiatus (vii. 191. 2).

There are several poems that imitate Leonidas of Tarentum and Antipater of Sidon—sometimes one, sometimes the other, and sometimes in such a way as to show familiarity with the poems of both poets on the same subject. We may distinguish those poems that show close verbal imitation and those that, in general, imitate style rather than specific details.

The four epigrams (vi. 16. 179–81) that deal with the theme of the three brothers, the hunter, the fisher, and the fowler, who dedicate to Pan the instruments of their craft, all show direct imitation both of Leonidas (vi. 13) and of Antipater's poem based on Leonidas (vi. 14).

<sup>20</sup> Examples of newly coined words are ἀφρηστά (vii. 214. 5), μελιβρομόν (vii. 696. 5), εὐκέντρῳ (ix. 339. 4), συνοχηδόν and ἀνέκδρομος (ix. 343. 3).

<sup>21</sup> For the use of metrical evidence made in this paper see Geffcken's discussion of the meter of Leonidas, "Leonidas von Tarentum," *Jahr. f. Phil. Suppl.*, XXIII (1897), 141–44. Geffcken bases his discussion on Meyer's *Zur Geschichte der griechischen und lateinischen Hexameters* ("Sitzungsberichte der königl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften" [1884], pp. 979–1022).

A very close verbal dependence upon the epigram of Leonidas is evident in all the poems, but the use of words that appear in Antipater's poem and not in that of Leonidas shows that the poet was also familiar with the poem of Antipater. The four poems are very much alike, and it is natural to suppose that they were all written by the same poet, who was trying to work out variations of the same theme.

A poem using the theme of three sisters who dedicate to Athena their spinning implements (vi. 39) imitates directly Leonidas' poem on the same theme (vi. 289). In both poems the first two lines give the names of the girls, their parentage, and their nationality. Archias' πολυδίνεα ἄτρακτον (39. 3) seems formed on the model of Leonidas' ἀειδίνητον ἄτρακτον (289. 3) and εἰροχαρῆ τάληρον (39. 6) is based on εἰροκόμον τάλαρον (289. 4). The idea expressed in the last two lines of Archias' poem is taken from another poem of Leonidas on the same subject (vi. 288). These poems of Leonidas were imitated in vi. 160 and 174 by Antipater of Sidon. Archias shows his familiarity with the latter poem by his use of the word ἀραχναιοῦ (39. 3) (*ἴσον ἀράχνᾳ* [174, 1]) and the phrase ἐσχον χερνῆτα βίον (39, 7) (*τὸν ἐκ χειρῶν ἀρνυμένα βίοτον* [174, 8]).

vi. 207 shows direct imitation of Antipater vi. 206. There happens to be no poem of Leonidas on this subject in the *Anthology*, but Antipater's poem may be based on an epigram of Leonidas now lost, for it is entirely in his manner and style. It takes up the theme of five girls who dedicate their ornaments to Aphrodite. The names of the five girls and the objects which they dedicate are the same in both cases, but there is a conscious effort to vary slightly the descriptive phrases used. ἀραχναιῆς (207. 6) and ἀραχναιοῦ (206. 6) are the only exact parallel. (Cf. the use of the same word in 39. 3.)

Archias' epigram vii. 68 imitates directly vii. 67, a poem of Leonidas, the address of Diogenes the Cynic to Charon. The parallel, phrase by phrase, is very close. An affirmative expression is changed to the corresponding negative: δέξαι μ' . . . τὸν κύνα Διογένην of Leonidas becomes in Archias μὴ προλίπης Διογένη με κύνα. A synonym may be substituted: ὕδωρ ὃς πλώεις becomes ὃς πορθμεύεις ὕδωρ; or a phrase may be taken over bodily with a change of case and tense: λείπω δ' οὐδὲν ὑπ' ἡελίῳ (67. 8), ὑπ' ἡελίου δ' οὐ τι λεῖπικα φάει (68. 8).

Leonidas' epigram vii. 163, a dialogue between the dead Praxo and the passerby, is closely imitated by the two following epigrams. vii. 164 is marked Antipater of Sidon and 165 *τοῦ αὐτοῦ οἱ δὲ Ἀρχίον*. Stadtmüller thinks that the name of Archias has been lost from 164 and assigns that poem to Archias and 165 to Antipater of Sidon—a view which has been generally accepted.<sup>22</sup> vii. 164 shows a much closer dependence on 165 than on 163 (cf., for instance, *λοχίοιστ* *ἐν ἀλγεσιν* [164, 5] and *ἀλγεσιν* *ἐν λοχίοις* [165, 4] and *φράξε*, *γύναι* [164, 1] and *εἰπὲ γύναι* [165, 1], etc.). But the writer of 164 was familiar with Leonidas' poem as well as that of Antipater (cf. ll. 5 and 6 of 164 and 5 and 6 of 163).

Though a different kind of poem, xvi. 179 shows the same method in imitating Leonidas and Antipater. It is a description of Apelles' picture of Aphrodite rising from the sea. The second line was evidently suggested by Leonidas 182. 2, 3, and the third line is taken from Antipater 178. 3; the similarity both of words and line arrangement of 178. 4 and 179. 4 may be noted.

Closely resembling in style the dedicatory epigrams just discussed is vi. 192, in which an old fisherman dedicates to Priapus the implements of his craft. It is very like Leonidas' poem on the same subject (vi. 4) both in theme and in style. Each contains a catalogue of fishing implements, modified by elaborate descriptive phrases. Yet except for the names of two of the fishing implements and the phrase *δηναὶ λείψανα* (192. 1, 2) with which may be compared *ἀρχαῖας λείψανα τεχνοτίνας* (4, 8), no word of Archias' poem seems to have been suggested by a word of Leonidas. In contrast to this we may note the striking verbal parallels between Archias' poem and vi. 23, an anonymous poem which is probably a Byzantine imitation of Archias.<sup>23</sup> Although vi. 192 is much less slavishly imitative of Leonidas than the other poems just discussed, it is so entirely in the manner of Leonidas and of these other poems imitating Leonidas and Antipater that it seems safe to assume that it was written by the same poet.

The complaint of a shipwrecked mariner at being buried too near the sea (vii. 278) belongs to a series of poems on the same theme. The

<sup>22</sup> Susemihl, *op. cit.*, II, 559. The argument is largely metrical (the presence in 164 of trochaic hiatus, avoided by Antipater of Sidon).

<sup>23</sup> It is one of three anonymous poems coming between two sections from the collection of Agathias.

subject was apparently first used by Asclepiades (vii. 284), who was followed by Leonidas (283), Posidippus (267), and Antipater (287; probably Antipater of Sidon, although marked simply Antipater). Archias' poem is not a close imitation of any of these, but the beginning of the poem may be compared with the beginning of Antipater's (287), and the phrase *οὐδὲν Ἀττίλης* may be reminiscent of *μηδὲν Ἀττίλαος* (Leonidas 283. 3). The name *Θῆρις* is found in Leonidas (vii. 295), where it is also used of a fisherman.

A dedication by a trumpeter of his trumpet to Athena (vi. 195) is based directly upon a poem by Tymnes (vi. 151), as the name of the trumpeter Παλλανάτος Μίκκος shows. But phrases in 195. 3, 4 directly imitated from vi. 46 show that the poet was clearly familiar with Antipater's poem on the same subject as well as that of Tymnes.

One may, I think, conclude that all these poems (vi. 16. 39, 179–81, 192, 195, 207; vii. 68. 164, 278; xvi. 179) were written by the same poet who imitated the poems of Leonidas of Tarentum and Antipater of Sidon.<sup>24</sup> Sometimes this imitation was very close and sometimes comparatively free, but it is always very evident. The epigrams of this poet were probably in the strophes of Meleager. vii. 164 is ordinarily placed there, and vi. 16 and vi. 207 follow sections from Meleager, while none is similarly placed in relation to sections from Philippus (see Weisshäupl, *op. cit.*).

Since vii. 278 is by Archias of Byzantium, if we are correct in thinking that these poems are all by the same poet, we must assign them to Archias of Byzantium rather than to Archias of Antioch. Those who attribute these poems to Archias of Antioch do so principally because of what Cicero says about the skill of his friend in extemporizing variations of the same theme (shown notably in 16. 179–81) and because Quintilian (x. 7. 19) couples together Archias and Antipater on the authority of Cicero. It may seem unlikely that there should have been a second Archias, who was an older contemporary of Archias of Antioch and who had the same proficiency in writing variations of the same theme, but it is certainly not impossible, since this sort of facility was evidently not unusual and Archias is not an un-

<sup>24</sup> ix. 343 also imitates Antipater (ix. 76) in theme though not closely in style or language, but is so much like ix. 339 that it seems necessary to attribute it to Archias of Mytilene rather than to Archias of Byzantium (see above). No poets in the *Greek Anthology* are imitated more freely than Leonidas and Antipater.

common name. If these poems are rightly placed in the stephanos of Meleager, they cannot have been written by Archias of Antioch, whose poems if they appeared in either collection must have been in that of Philippus (see above). There is no reason why Archias of Byzantium may not be identical with Archias, the grammarian, to whom vi. 195 is attributed.

The most marked characteristic of the style of these poems is the frequency with which newly coined words, for the most part compound adjectives, are used. In this the poet resembles Leonidas and Antipater of Sidon. The fourteen examples in eleven poems may be compared with the five examples in the eight poems of Archias of Mytilene.<sup>25</sup> As for meter, there are four examples of trochaic hiatus (vi. 16. 5; vii. 164. 7, 9; vi. 180. 6) and five of dactylic hiatus (vi. 39. 1 [2]; vi. 195. 3; vi. 180. 1; vii. 278. 5) in contrast to the absence of trochaic hiatus and the single case of dactylic hiatus in the poems of Archias of Mytilene.

The three poems of Archias in the tenth book seem from their similarity in theme and style to have been written by the same poet. Seven and eight are variations of the same theme—the statue of Priapus, set up on the shore by sailors (7) or fishermen (8), speaks. In 10 it is the statue of Pan, likewise set up on the shore, who speaks. Certain similarities in language may be noted. These poems are not direct imitations of any one poem of Leonidas but there are indications that the poet was familiar with his work, as, indeed, any later writer of epigrams would be very likely to be. Priapus, the harbor god, appears in x. 1 (Leonidas) addressing the sailors. The phrase ὅπερ θέμις (x. 7. 5) suggests ὅστον θέμις (vi. 44, 5) and ὡς θέμις (vi. 4. 8) and βαιδὸς ἰδεῖν (8. 1) recalls μικρὸς ἰδεῖν of vii. 198. 1. But these resemblances do not show the same sort of indebtedness to some one poem of Leonidas as the poems of Archias of Byzantium do.

x. 10 is by Archias νεώτερος. ix. 91, a brief address to Hermes in dedicating a simple offering, is by the same poet. ix. 91 is generally assigned to the collection of Philippus (Weisshäupl, *op. cit.*). One may conclude, then, that x. 7, 8, 10 and ix. 91 are all by the same

<sup>25</sup> εἰναλίφοιτα (vi. 16. 4); πολυδίνεα (vi. 39. 3); πολυσπαθέων (vi. 39. 5); εὐθροον, εἰροχαρῆ (vi. 39. 6); βιαρκέος (vi. 179. 1); ἔθροχον, δειραχθές (vi. 179. 3); οἴρεστουκε (vi. 181. 1); σαγηναίον (vi. 192. 1); τριτάνυστον (vi. 192. 5); ἀρπεδόσιν (vi. 207. 6); περισφύριον (vi. 207. 7); δλιμρήκτον (vii. 278. 3).

poet, Archias the Younger, whose poems were included in the collection of Philippus. Since we have no reason to think that there were two poets of the name of Archias in the collection of Philippus, we may, I think, draw the conclusion that this Archias the Younger was in all probability Archias of Antioch whose poems were apparently in that stephanos, if in either.

We must next consider what other epigrams may have been written by the same poet. We know from Cicero (*De divin.* i. 79) that Archias of Antioch wrote at least one poem describing a work of art. We have seen that one such poem (xvi. 179) from its resemblance to other poems in its imitation of Leonidas was probably by an earlier Archias, Archias of Byzantium. The two-line epigram on a carved gem (ix. 750) may, however, very well belong to this poet.<sup>26</sup> It may very plausibly be regarded as coming from the stephanos of Philippus as do several other poems on carved gems in this group (747, 748, 751, all by Plato). Consequently, although there is no other positive evidence, there seems to be no reason to doubt that it was written by this Archias.

xvi. 94 is also an epigram describing a work of art, a statue of Heracles. Its most striking feature is the remarkable use of long compound adjectives, six in the eight lines, of which five were apparently coined by the poet. The language and style have nothing in common with either the younger Archias or Archias of Mytilene, but in its use of new compound words the poem is more like those of Archias of Byzantium (see above), although it is unlike the poems of this poet in showing no direct imitation of Leonidas or Antipater. As far as meter is concerned, the case of trochaic hiatus (xvi. 94. 6) is further evidence for assigning it to this poet since this metrical irregularity appears in the poems under discussion only in his poems.

xv. 51 is an epigram describing a statue of the Calydonian boar. Unlike xvi. 94, it has no long newly coined compound words. The language is strikingly epic. One may compare particularly *Iliad* xi. 416; xiii. 473, 474; and *The Shield of Heracles*, lines 388-91. It does not resemble any of these poems that have been discussed, but it does resemble, in this use of Homeric language, vii. 147. This is a

<sup>26</sup> This poem is closely related to two other poems on the same subject: ix. 746 by Polemo and ix. 747 by Plato (probably Plato the Younger).

sepulchral epigram in honor of Ajax, a theme found also in the poems of Asclepiades (vii. 145) and Antipater of Sidon (vii. 146). However, it is not an imitation of either of these poems; for the theme is developed in a quite different way and the main idea of their poems, Virtue sitting on the tomb of Ajax and mourning that Fraud is triumphant, is not used. With the simile of 147. 5, 6 compare *Iliad* xv. 618, 619. Examples of Homeric words are ἐναιρομένοισιν (l. 1), χερμαδίων (l. 3), προβλήσ (l. 5). The sepulchral epigram in honor of Hector (vii. 140)<sup>27</sup> also uses Homeric language (*μαρνάμενος* and *κηρὶ δαμεῖς*, for instance). Of course it is natural that the language should be Homeric in poems on Homeric subjects and does not necessarily mean that a poet might not use entirely different language in a poem on a different subject. Still the use of Homeric language is certainly striking in these three poems, and suggests the possibility that they were written by a poet who had written epic poems, as we know Archias of Antioch had. The influence of Anyte may be seen in 140 (ὑπὲρ πάτρας δ' ὥλετο μαρνάμενος [4] may be compared with ὡς θανεῖς τρὸν φίλας μαρνάμενος πατρίδος [vii. 724. 4]), and, in fact, the whole scheme of Archias' epigram in which the stele speaks may very well have been suggested by Anyte's *πέτρος ἀείδει* (724. 3). This may be used as evidence that this poem was written by Archias of Mytilene, who seems to have been considerably indebted to this poet; but, on the other hand, the influence of Anyte is fairly widespread among the poets of the *Anthology* and would not in itself be enough to assign the poem to Archias of Mytilene. The first line of 140 reminds us of vii. 164—a poem which seems to have been written by Archias of Byzantium. But the striking use of epic language differentiates xv. 51; vii. 140; and vii. 147 so completely from the rest of the poems that it seems probable that they were all written by the same poet. While the evidence is not conclusive, I should be inclined to attribute them to the only epic poet we know of this name, Archias of Antioch.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> vii. 140 is the epigram given by the lemma to Archias of Macedon, but probably wrongly so assigned (see above). Menk gives this to Archias of Byzantium since he thinks that 138–40 is a fragment of Philippus and assumes that all epigrams of Archias in this collection are by that Archias (*op. cit.*, p. 49).

<sup>28</sup> Reinach uses this as evidence that all the epigrams marked simply 'Αρχίας are by Archias of Antioch (*op. cit.*, p. 33).

The poems of the fifth book seem to be by the same poet. v. 58 and v. 98 ("Αδηλον οι δὲ Ἀρχίον") develop the theme of Meleager (v. 198. 5, 6) and v. 59 is not essentially different in theme or style. These three epigrams are all in the group of poems (1-103) which seem to have been in the collection of Rufinus but probably came originally from Meleager's stephanos, which Rufinus may very well have used. v. 58, 59 directly follow a section from Meleager's collection (Weiss-häupl, *op. cit.*, p. 2). In general, erotic poems are more popular in Meleager's stephanos than in that of Philippus. If these poems belonged to the collection of Meleager, it seems more natural to attribute them to Archias of Mytilene than to the poet of the dedicatory epigrams of the sixth book, Archias of Byzantium. The poets whom Archias of Byzantium imitated, Leonidas of Tarentum and Antipater of Sidon, abstain, for the most part, from erotic poems, and it is probable that he followed them in choice of theme. Some contributory evidence for this view can be seen in a study of the meter. The only exceptions to the rule that a masculine caesura in the third foot may not directly follow an iambic word are found in v. 58. 3 and ix. 19. 9—a poem by Archias of Mytilene. Of the three cases in which the first half of a pentameter is allowed to end in an iambic word, two cases are found in v. 98. 2 and ix. 111. 6—another poem of Archias of Mytilene. We may, then, add v. 58, 59, and 98 to the poems of Archias of Mytilene.

There are several poems yet to be considered of which the attribution to Archias is doubtful. I think that no one at present doubts that Planudes is wrong in attributing ix. 345, 346, 347, 348, 351 to Archias, and that the *Palatine Anthology* is right in giving them to Leonidas of Alexandria; for they belong to a group of poems by him which are isopsephe (344-56).

xvi. 154 is marked Λουκιάνου οι δὲ Ἀρχίον. The pastoral atmosphere of the poem, with its mention of Pan and the shepherds, suggests Archias of Mytilene (in particular vii. 696) rather than the moralizing or satirical epigrams that have come down to us under the name of Lucian.<sup>29</sup> The phrase ἀντίτυπον φθογγήν ξυπαλιν ἀδομένην

<sup>29</sup> For Geffcken's view that Lucian of Samosata left no epigrams but that those with his name are either by Lucilius or by an unknown Byzantine moralist see *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, LII (1932), 1090.

(xvi. 154. 2) suggests ἀντίφθογγον . . . κρέξασα οἴλα τις ἀχώ . . . ἀντωδόῖς χειλεστιν ἀρμονίαν of vii. 191 (Archias of Mytilene). The fact that in xvi. 154. 4 the first half of the pentameter ends with an iambic word is further evidence that, if it is by Archias, it is by Archias of Mytilene since the only other cases of this metrical irregularity occur in poems probably by him (ix. 111. 6 and v. 98. 2).<sup>30</sup>

ix. 27 is marked '*Αρχίου οἱ δὲ Παρμενίων*'. Stadtmüller points out its resemblance to ix. 345 and vii. 548 by Leonidas of Alexandria, and suggests certain emendations which would turn it into an *ἰσοψηφόν* and make it possible to attribute it to that poet (*op. cit.*). However, there seems to be no reason to ignore the lemma entirely. It is on the same subject as xvi. 154, but the setting is not pastoral, and the rather smart, rhetorical style of *τὰν λάλον . . . κού λάλον* and of lines 3 and 4 seems to be more like Parmenion than any of the poets called Archias. The metrical evidence would give it to Archias of Mytilene, if to any Archias, as the use of a masculine caesura in the third foot directly following an iambic word (ix. 27. 3) and the ending of the first half of a pentameter in an iambic word (ix. 27. 2 and 4) are found only in the poems of that Archias (see above). On the other hand, this sort of metrical irregularity is found also in the poems of Parmenion (ix. 43. 3; ix. 113. 1; ix. 69. 2; xvi. 216. 2). Although the evidence is not very strong, I should be inclined to attribute this epigram to Parmenion rather than to Archias.

ix. 64 is marked '*Ασκληπιάδου οἱ δὲ Αρχίου*'. Stadtmüller thinks that this belongs to Archias and points out resemblances in language to xvi. 179. 1; vii. 696. 6; vi. 207. 9; ix. 19; vi. 16; vi. 180; vii. 213; xv. 51. 6 or, in other words, to poems by Archias of Mytilene, Archias of Byzantium, and the younger Archias. Knaack, on the other hand, thinks that it should be given to Asclepiades.<sup>31</sup> On the whole, it seems more like Archias of Mytilene than any other Archias, but I feel that the evidence is not conclusive enough to decide whether it is by Archias or by Asclepiades.

To conclude, then, there seem to have been two poets by the name

<sup>30</sup> This is not evidence against Lucian's authorship, since there is a marked metrical carelessness in his poems and this metrical irregularity is not uncommon (x. 27. 2; ix. 367. 6; xi. 401. 8).

<sup>31</sup> Susemihl, *op. cit.*, II, 560.

of Archias whose epigrams were in the collection of Meleager—Archias of Mytilene and Archias of Byzantium. To Archias of Mytilene, who was influenced by Anyte and her school, are given in the *Palatine Anthology* vii. 696; ix. 19; ix. 111; ix. 339. To him may also be attributed, because of similarity in theme, style, diction, and meter, vii. 191, 213, 214 and ix. 343. The three poems of the fifth book (58, 59, 98) I have assigned to the same poet, partly because of metrical evidence and partly because, belonging, as they probably do, to the Meleager stephanos, it seems more likely that they were written by this Archias than by Archias of Byzantium. I should also give to Archias of Mytilene xvi. 154, partly again from metrical evidence and partly from similarity in language and tone.

Archias of Byzantium, also in the collection of Meleager, was a poet who imitated more or less closely the poems of Leonidas of Tarentum and Antipater of Sidon. In addition to vii. 278 (marked with his name in the *Palatine Anthology*), I should give to him also vi. 16, 39, 179–81, 192, 195, 207; vii. 68, 164; xvi. 179. These poems differ somewhat in the closeness with which they imitate Leonidas and Antipater, but all show a clear dependence on one or the other, if not both, and have a general resemblance in vocabulary and meter. xvi. 94, which is not an imitation of either of these poets, may also be attributed to him because of the striking use of newly coined words, a marked characteristic of this poet, and because of the use of the same metrical irregularity. Since one of these poems, vi. 195, is apparently by Archias the grammarian, that poet may be identified with Archias of Byzantium.

To Archias the Younger are attributed in the *Palatine Anthology* x. 10 and ix. 91. Because of similarity of style I should give to him also x. 7 and x. 8. Since this poet belonged to the stephanos of Philippus, it is natural to identify him with Archias of Antioch, whose epigrams, if in either stephanos, would have been in that of Philippus. As we know that Archias of Antioch wrote verses on a work of art, ix. 750, which apparently came from the collection of Philippus, may also be assigned to him. The three poems (xv. 51; vii. 140; vii. 147), which resemble each other in style and vocabulary because of their unusual use of Homeric language, may very well also be given to Archias of Antioch, since he was, as far as we know, the only one of

these poets who wrote epic poems. It is only in x. 7 and 8 that we see the facility in composing poems on the same theme which is mentioned by Cicero, but this may be only the result of the vicissitudes of fortune.<sup>32</sup>

As for the other poems, there is no doubt that ix. 345, 346, 347, 348, 351 are by Leonidas of Alexandria. I should give ix. 27 to Parmenion rather than to Archias. I feel that there is not enough evidence to show whether ix. 64 was written by Asclepiades or by Archias of Mytilene.

One criterion which might be expected to be of help in determining the authorship of these epigrams has proved of no value—the dialect. Geffcken<sup>33</sup> has pointed out that the dialect in the poems of Leonidas is mixed, as Doric forms are often found in the same poems with Attic, etc. This is true of the poems of Archias also, and when there is a mixture of dialects in one poem, one cannot use dialectic differences as a criterion in determining the authorship of various poems.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

<sup>32</sup> Benndorf (*De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae ad artes spectant* [Bonn, 1862], pp. 58–59) lists as written by one and the same poet whom he calls Archias of Antioch xv. 51; xvi. 179; x. 7, 8; ix. 750; xvi. 94; and vii. 696.

<sup>33</sup> "Leonidas von Tarentum," *Jahr. f. Phil. Suppl.*, XXIII (1897), 144–76.

## CONTINUITY OF TIME IN PLAUTUS

JOHN N. HOUGH

IT HAS long been a commonplace that Plautus does not observe either a so-called unity of time or a consistent time sequence. His loose use of temporal adverbs frustrates any attempt to distinguish between the implications of *mox* and *iam*, of *dudum*, *iam dudum*, and *modo*.<sup>1</sup> Hence much emphasis has been placed on the "vacant stage" as an indication of temporal continuity or of theoretical act divisions. But the voluminous literature on this subject has only rarely preserved a careful distinction between continuity of action and continuity of time. The study of the former, admirably conducted by C. C. Conrad,<sup>2</sup> reveals in the dramatic techniques surrounding vacant stages and apparent pauses a criterion by which continuous action can be judged. But the continuity of time, which may often conflict with the continuity of action, is the impression made by the dramatist upon the audience of the uneven passage of time in different parts of the action. The same processes by which Conrad shows continuity of action to have been obtained necessarily destroy the continuity of time practically before its inception, and therefore make the task of building up an impression of continuity more difficult. It is the passages which attempt this task which I wish to discuss in this paper.

But we must first pursue the distinction between time and action a step further. Conrad's method is first to establish a disregard of time values in scene complexes which are not interrupted by a vacant stage. Finding this, it is a natural inference that "the consideration of time in estimating the significance of vacant stages is not a valid criterion."<sup>3</sup> This method is proper when the continuity of action alone is the object of study, but that is only half of the process through which Plautus

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Langen, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus* (1880), pp. 33–43; Conrad, *The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy* (diss.; Chicago: Banta, 1915), pp. 22 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

went.<sup>4</sup> We have the vacant stages, and we have disregard of time even between them, but it is unfair to imply that the existence of time discrepancies between vacant stages necessarily means that when we find similar discrepancies over a vacant stage, the vacant stage has nothing to do with them. The fault with this apparently sound method lies in paying no attention to such passages, obvious as they are, as I shall list presently, which clearly suggest the passage of time within these very scene complexes not interrupted by a vacant stage, and which therefore explain the disregard of time of which Conrad complains. Conrad of course saw these passages, but failed except in one instance to attach to them any significance in his study.<sup>5</sup> It is my purpose not to deny that these discrepancies exist but to point out how Plautus always inserts "remedies" to reconstruct his time continuity after it has been destroyed by the exigencies of continuity of action.

Plautus of course does not indicate the amount of time elapsed by the use of different adverbs; neither could he record on a program the passage of time between scenes; nor, finally, was his public concerned whether a character should make a return trip to the forum in eight or eighty lines. But Plautus could, and did, effectively create the impression of time passing, and more important still, he does it by means of passages placed most frequently immediately before, after, or otherwise directly bearing upon vacant stages, which, for the purposes of realism, must indicate a lapse of time. A sentence, a few words, or even merely an adverb may be thrown in, often very inconspicuously, to give us a sympathetic impression of the passage of time at a rate proper to the action. These passages are so pointedly emphatic that

<sup>4</sup> Conrad (*ibid.*, p. 25, n. 14) says that the work of Polczyk (*De unilatibus et loci et temporis in nova comoedia observatis* [diss.; Vrat. 1909]) is in some measure robbed of its value through failure to take into account the possibility of a lapse of time when the stage is vacant. It is clear, then, that Conrad recognizes the distinction between time and action, but he does not treat the former as a separate technique. I have been forced to the conclusion that the significance of such passages as this paper discusses has been concealed by their obviousness. Their function in expressing the passage of time has been taken for granted, because it is so obvious, but to my knowledge no treatise on Plautus has analyzed the skill with which they are disposed.

<sup>5</sup> When Tranio in *Most.* 542 says *sed quidnam hic sese tam cito recepit domum?* Conrad notes (*op. cit.*, p. 26, n. 18) that here "the dramatist seems to admit that he has handled time-relations with considerable freedom." But there is no suggestion that this is a "remedy" for a situation caused by the technique of continuous action.

it is difficult to escape the conclusion that they were introduced with the definite purpose of explaining to the audience that dramatic time is passing with, and sometimes faster than, the action.<sup>6</sup> The emphasis gained, by position, phraseology, and pertinence to the plot, varies so greatly that it will be convenient to divide our passages into groups. Let us first examine a few representatives of the most marked group.

At *Amph.* 854 Amphitruo departs to seek Naucrates. At 860 occurs a vacant stage which in itself does not require a pause. The stage remains occupied (note that the vacant stage at 983 is not real) until the departing Mercury sees Amphitruo returning. Here the latter's vivid narration of his long search is quite unnecessary (1009-14); the first two lines would be sufficient were it not that Plautus is extremely careful to make it clear that considerable time has passed since 854, certainly much more than it takes to act one hundred and fifty lines.

At *Bacch.* 109 the passage of time is clearly indicated by Lydus: *iam dudum . . . tacitus sequor, exspectans . . .* Note here how Plautus has created the impression of time passing since Pistoclerus' departure from the girls at 100, a space ridiculously brief for his business even if he hurries (as he says he will), not to speak of having been followed *iam dudum*.<sup>7</sup> But the adverbs, whether loosely used or not, are effective.

At *Cas.* 530 Lysidamus departs to the forum. A vacant stage preceded at 514. At 540 Alcesimus, whose wife had not yet been invited to Lysidamus' house at 481, states that she has been ready and waiting *iam dudum*. There are no vacant stages until Lysidamus' return in

<sup>6</sup> This is not to deny that the same passages may serve other purposes simultaneously; that they do only adds to the skill with which they were conceived. A frequent entrance motif is the narration in monologue of action offstage (*Circ.* 590), naturally quite necessary to the lucidity of the plot. Very similar is the statement by one of two entering characters that he now understands something which the other has been telling him (*Pseud.* 694), thereby assuring the audience that he is ready to enter the plot at the latest stage of its development. But it would be prejudice not to recognize in such passages also the implication that inasmuch as more time is necessary for the described action than is actually consumed since its inception, that time must now be considered to have passed. It is in passages such as these that time and action again come together, for they are both made continuous by these simple stage devices. Leo's theory of "Der Monolog im Drama" (1908) and Conrad's treatment of monologues recognize this, but they do not go beyond to find other passages indicating time but not action, nor analyze the methods of time continuity.

<sup>7</sup> The problem of XOPOU does not affect us here. Cf. Conrad, *op. cit.*, p. 74: in any case "the two sisters are off the stage before the entering characters appear."

563, when he says: *contrivi diem, dum asto advocatus cuidam cognato meo* (566). Hardly could we conceive of a more effective way of making the day progress within sixty-six lines.<sup>8</sup>

The *Menaechmi* shows a number of interesting passages. At 446 Peniculus enters after a vacant stage, describing how Menaechmus gave him the slip at the meeting (they left the stage together at 217), and now is disgusted, *but not amazed*, that the meal they had arranged with Erotium is over. Further impression of time passing is afforded by Sosicles' narration of his activities (473 f.) since 446. Menaechmus himself returns at 571 (a vacant stage occurred at 558) with the conventional story of delay, and assumes that the meal is over. Extreme distortion occurs when the *senex* goes to fetch the doctor and returns within five lines (875–81), but be it noted that it is with the complaint that he had to wait a very long time, and even now cannot hurry the *medicus*. The reconciliation of time to action here has taxed the playwright's skill to the utmost.

At *Poen.* 504, after a vacant stage Agorastocles chides the *advocati* for their slowness; they retaliate in 525, on his unnecessary haste.

In *Pseud.* 1024 Pseudolus fears that Harpax will become impatient of delay (since 665 with vacant stages at 766 and 904), and return without awaiting summons. Ballio adds the impression of time passing at 1052 (vacant stage with no pause at 1051), *nunc demum mi animus in tuto locost*. Enter Simo at 1063 with typical entrance motif: "I'll see if Pseudolus has done anything *yet*." Finally Harpax appears, justifying Pseudolus' fears; he has waited "too long." Anxious to hasten Ballio, he states *iam diem multum esse* (1157; cf. *Truc.* 912, *dies teritur*, which, with other time references at 699, 816, and 914, bears upon the last vacant stage in the play, at 698). After a vacant

<sup>8</sup> A long-standing difficulty in the *Casina* may perhaps be resolved by recognizing the emphatic nature of the delay motif in 618–19. It has often been noted that when Pardalisea tells of Casina's madness in 621–719, her statement that this scheme was cooked up by Cleostrata and *hae ex proximo* (687) contradicts the known movements of the latter (Myrrhina), whom Cleostrata determined not to ask to her house, and who certainly had not gone at 614 where her husband agrees to send her—*per hortum*. May not Alcesimus do this, and the women hatch the plans while Lysidamus, alone for five lines, creates the impression of time passing, even without a vacant stage, by such a remark as . . . *Venerem . . . quoi sic tot amanti mi obviam eveniant morae?* Other action of longer duration has elsewhere been relegated to five lines (cf. *Men.* 875–80, treated next).

stage at 1244 Pseudolus, who has been drinking since 1051, caps the impression of finality and retrospect with *hunc diem sumpsimus* (1269).

After a vacant stage at *Rud.* 1190, Daemones complains of the length of time his wife has been kissing their newly found daughter (though he had taken her in the house at but 1182).

In a second group are passages less definite in their reference to actual time spent or wasted, but which imply no less certainly a break in the continuity:

*Amph.* 1081: Bromia is still (*etiam nunc*) dazed. Actually she has been talking only since the thunderbolt at 1052 by which Amphitruo was struck down (his body occupies an otherwise vacant stage when Bromia entered [1053]). Another clear signpost that time has passed is *ita erae meae hodie contigit* (1061), which prefaces Bromia's story of Hercules' birth and exploits. The use of *hodie* instead of "just now" or "at this moment" (all this happens during the vacant stage at 1052) is clearly intended to give us a point of view from a considerable time later, when we look back on the day in retrospect; the same shade of meaning exists in English. Other good examples are *Pseud.* 1269 and *Men.* 473 above, and *Most.* 531, below; cf. also *Pseud.* 1309 (perfect tense, but no *hodie*) and *Asin.* 362; contrast the immediate quality of *Pseud.* 667-93.

After a vacant stage at *Epid.* 606, Stratoppocles is exasperated at the tardiness of the *danista*, again in 627-28. Of Epidicus' leisureliness he also complains by using *incedit* (608); cf. *Men.* 888, above, of the doctor.

At *Merc.* 667 Dorippa enters from the farm having heard from a slave sent out at 279 that Lysimachus is not coming out. Her remarks here show that the aged Syra is slow (*incedit* [671]), and several passages between 279 and 667 have indicated the advance of time: 556, Demipho is hungry, not having eaten since the play opened: 596, the impatient Charinus complains that Eutychus is long overdue.

At *Most.* 348 Tranio enters as *servus currens* (itself of course implying haste); at 383 Philolaches echoes "my father *aderit iam*" (Theopropides enters 431). Tranio, having tricked the old man, rejoices, *quid ego hodie negoti confeci mali* (531), of which the implication has been explained above.

In a third group we may find merely a conventional phrase, which

refers to the passing of time only within the limits of one scene, or series of scenes without a vacant stage intervening. These are so common that it is tempting to dismiss them as meaningless formulas, but I think rather that they perform the important function of indicating that time is passing even more rapidly than the action of these continuous scenes would require. Since longer offstage action is often performed during a scene on the stage, these references within the scenes do no small service in preparing us for the completion of the action offstage. A few familiar examples will suffice: *sed quid ego hic properans concessi pedibus, lingua largior?* (*Asin.* 290); *sed nimis longius loquor; diu me estis demorati* (*Epid.* 376); *Cesso ire ego quo missa sum* (*Persa* 197); *it dies; ego mihi cesso* (*Pseud.* 240a). Since these phrases often occur when a reasonable interpretation assures us the characters who speak them are not really wasting time on the stage, they can hardly be mere persiflage.<sup>9</sup> Many similar expressions refer to a particular point in the play or scenes, but are of no less general application than those above: *iam diu est factum quom . . .* (*Asin.* 251); *iurgio tandem uxorem abegi* (*Men.* 127); *nam nihil etiam dum harpagavit . . . praeter . . .* (*Pseud.* 957).

Finally, we must not forget that in a theater without the technical refinements to which we are accustomed the very fact of distortion may have been in itself an aid to the creation of the illusion of time

<sup>9</sup> Conrad states (p. 34) that "the time-interval allowed for the completion of offstage action may be shortened or lengthened practically without limit and depends upon the nature of the material to be presented upon the stage during that interval." This seems to me to be stating the case backward. If the indications of time passing within scenes is taken into consideration, it is fairer to say that the rapidity with which time is imagined to be passing during a given scene may vary with what offstage action is going on at the same time. I admit that this does not seem to take care of such extreme cases as *Men.* 875-80, yet unless the offstage action has some part in controlling the time references in the dialogue, rather than being controlled by them, what is the purpose of inserting the time references in the first place, and why are they always so carefully placed in positions where they do the most good? In any case such passages as those discussed in the text above, when combined with knowledge of offstage action, definitely suggest that time is passing more rapidly than the accompanying onstage action, and thereby detract from Conrad's discussion of scenes complexes without vacant stage, i.e., those "portions of the play in which the action is continuous, for in these alone, in the absence of any possible pause, is the time-element clearly defined" (p. 25). It is clearly defined, but not, I think, as Conrad would have it, as proceeding at an even rate consistent with the action. It is a compromise between the action onstage and that offstage, controlled and indicated, as best as can be done, by temporal references.

passing (cf. *Men.* 875–80, 882–89, discussed above). The familiar convention by which a person long expected (*Truc.* 203) and wished for (*ibid.* 481) conveniently arrives (next line) suggests, if not too subtly, that the waiting has been long and tiresome. The rapidity with which a character such as Lysiteles in *Trin.* 1115 may learn news from Stasimus, who only went into the house to inform him at 1114 (vacant stage between), indicates the passing of time without further ado. Perhaps the best (or worst) example is *Cist.* 774; Demipho enters from the forum, having heard not only that the whole town is talking of his newly found daughter but also that Lampadio is searching for him. The daughter was found only in the previous scene (671–773) from which Lampadio did not depart to seek his master until the very end! The vacant stage and Demipho's pointed remarks (*omnes homines fabulantur per vias*) are one of the less skilful methods of indicating a lapse of time.

Other illustrations of all these types can be duplicated on almost every page of Plautus; they are familiar to every student of comedy, and especially so to students of the technique of motivation. The point I wish to emphasize, however, is the skilful disposition of these various impressionistic indications at critical situations following necessary pauses, in such a fashion that as little violence as possible is done to realism. Let us first consider the statistics.

Of 109 theoretical vacant stages, 6 are actually not so and may be dropped from further consideration (e.g., *Amph.* 983). Of the remaining 103, in 65 the plot shows no necessity for a pause, but in 30 of these there are following passages which suggest the passage of time. These passages are usually of the less clearly defined type, but nevertheless are inserted to take care of and aid in the illusion of time passing at a point a little later than the actual vacant stage in question (as suggested above in connection with offstage action). In the other 35 places, where no pause is necessary, there is none indicated. The balance of the vacant stages, 38 in number, all require an imaginary pause and in every case are followed either immediately or before the next vacant stage, by passages intended to produce this effect. It is only natural that the bulk of the passages illustrated in my first group of examples (i.e., those which most clearly state a definite passage of time) are employed after vacant stages of this last type.

Second, we should observe the relative position of the 35 vacant stages above mentioned (wherein there is neither pause nor indication of such) to the other 30 and 38. A large proportion of the 30 appear near the beginning of the plays where new subjects and new characters are still being introduced, where there is no connection between the action and characters of one scene (or set of scenes) with those of the next, or where the action is of so general a nature that it fits equally well into the time of another scene which might require a more rigid setting. A few examples follow: *Asin.* 127: *exeunt* Libanus and Demaenetus; vacant stage; enter Argyrippus soliloquizing on the troubles of love (as he might do any time). *Asin.* 744: vacant stage; enter Diabolus and parasite (new characters) whose arrival ties up in time with the rest of the play only in that it must follow Argyrippus' winning of the money. These persons occupy the stage until the next vacant stage. *Bach.* 169: enter Chrysalus from abroad; no time setting. *Capt.* 194: *Exeunt* Ergasilus and Hegio; vacant stage; enter captives and overseer; the connection between these sets of characters comes only with Hegio's re-entrance (251), where the conception of time begins. *Aul.* 586: vacant stage; enter Strobilus (new character) generalizing; it requires the appearance of Euclio (608) to bring him temporally into the action. Thus we see that usually near the beginning of action, but occasionally later if circumstances permit (*Asin.* 744; *Aul.* 586), vacant stages where no pause is necessary are not naturally followed by indications of time passing, unless (as in the case of the other 30 examples where no pause is necessary) it is convenient to begin the impressions earlier than is actually necessary.

Conrad's work has shown how the impression of continuity of action has been obtained through the various devices he studies—an impression which must indeed have been necessary for a Roman audience. Yet such an impression of the continuity of action deliberately falsifies any possible continuity of time, since no play continues from beginning to end on an even rate of speed consistent with actual production time. Were any steps taken by the playwright to remedy this situation?

The prevalence of temporal adverbs (no matter how loosely used) and the numerous passages which note the passage of time, either by direct statement or by implication, cannot be wholly without purpose.

It would be strange, too, if the skill with which they are used were wholly accidental. I believe they were employed to reconstruct the ruin of the continuity of time which the devices of the continuity of action had wrought. Nor is this to deny that this initial destruction of time was necessary; it was, and still is, wherever an audience requires amusement more than art, and where dialogue and monologue must first be arranged around exits and entrances in such a way as to make the action continuous. But the playwright did not stop there. With the plot outlined in his mind, there came simultaneously (or afterward as insertions and finishing touches)<sup>10</sup> with the writing of the dialogue these passages, inserted with such skill that they fit naturally in their place and unobtrusively fulfil their function without ruining art by revealing it. At best the restoration of the sequence of time can only be partial when no programs are available, but for the accomplishment of the ancient playwrights without this aid, resting solely on skill of disposition, admiration cannot be withheld.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

<sup>10</sup> The skill with which the references are made precludes the artificial practice of insertion after the play was finished, except in some rather awkward cases, which may well be marks of Plautine handling. The problem of to whom this technique belongs, Plautus or his Greek model, cannot in every case be determined, but some passages which suggest waste of time, coming at the end of suspected Plautine additions (e.g., *Asin.* 307; cf. Fraenkel, *Plaut. im Plaut.* [Berlin, 1922], p. 143), betray the Roman's handiwork. The fragments of Menander do not preserve sufficient continuity to enable us to determine fully his relation to this technique. And, in any case, this would reflect more than many other points of dramatic technique the individual characteristics of the author.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### ON A VERSE IN VERGIL *AENEID* II. 255 AND THE POST-HOMERIC TRADITION CONCERNING THE CAPTURE OF TROY

A verse in Vergil's *Aeneid*, the meaning of which was a matter of considerable concern to editors prior to the last fifty years and which has since been consistently misinterpreted, as I hope to prove, is verse 255 of Book ii, especially the phrase *silentia lunae*. In contrast to the horror of the Laocoön episode, the poet has been describing the triumphal entry of the wooden horse into Troy amid hymns of joy, in spite of a last word of warning from Cassandra, *dei iussu non umquam credita Teucris*. Then come verses 250-57:

Vertitur interea caelum et ruit Oceano nox  
involvens umbra magna terramque polumque  
Myrmidonumque dolos; fusi per moenia Teueri  
conticuere; sopor fessos complectitur artus.  
Et iam Argiva phalanx instructis navibus ibat  
a Tenedo tacitae per amica *silentia lunae*  
litora nota petens, flamas cum regia puppis  
extulerat.

Page's edition<sup>1</sup> contains the orthodox modern interpretation together with a concise statement of the difficulties involved:

"Through the friendly silence of the peaceful moon." Virgil dwells on the "light" and "quiet" which make their passage easy, and ignores the danger which attended an attack by moonlight. The moonlight is also mentioned in 340, but in 250, 360, 397, 420, & one might add 621> the darkness is dwelt on. In agricultural writers *luna silenti* is "when there is no moon" (cf. Milton, *S.A.*, 871), and some so explain here.

This is the interpretation of the principal school editions, of Papillon and Haigh in a lame note, and of Mackail, although he admits he is intrigued by the suggestion of Servius that there was a quarter-moon. Servius' note on verse 255 runs as follows:

Amica sibi grata et sciendum, septima luna captam esse Troiam, to which Servius Danielis adds, quae tunc erat dividuo orbis modo.<sup>2</sup> Hinc est quod dicit (340) oblati per lunam et alibi (397) per caecam noctem. Tacitae Lunae aut more poetico noctem significat aut physicam rationem dixit. Servius Danielis adds Tacitae Lunae cuius tempore tacetur, quoniam nocte silentium est, and on verse 360, Nox atra cava circumvolat umbra, hinc apparet occidisse iam lunam.

<sup>1</sup> *The Aeneid of Virgil* (London, 1910), p. 227.

<sup>2</sup> This phrase, of course, means the quarter-moon, but not necessarily the first quarter as interpreted by Mackail.

Donatus (p. 182), in his note on verse 255, remarks:

Multi vitium putant scribentis, ut qui dixit "et ruit Oceano nox involvens umbra magna terramque polumque Myrmidonumque dolos" hic diceret tacitae per amica silentia lunae. Nullum in hoc vitium est si quidem nonnullae noctes habent primas partia tenebrosas, sequentes vero luna superveniente inlustris. Tale ergo noctis tempus elegerant Graeci quod tenebras haberet oportunas complendis insidiis et somni quietem daret et dehinc aliquid luminis ex radiis lunae, ut sine periculo vel errore venirent a Tenedo ad civitatis excidium.<sup>3</sup>

And on verse 340 (p. 194):

.... Noctem debemus accipere quales sunt plerumque, cum luna non per omne spatium noctis apparat.

On verse 360 (p. 196) he develops this thought.

Politian<sup>4</sup> quotes Servius' note in full, but ignores his suggestion that *luna* may equal *nox*. After endeavoring to refute the theory of the music of the spheres, he quotes the use of *luna silens* in Cato and Pliny as referring to the interlunium and continues:

*Nondum igitur luna lucebat*, cum illi a Tenedo sub vesperam navigabant. Sed lucere tum coepit, cum iam urbem occupaverant. Non igitur aut sera fuerit, aut pernox luna, tum nec lunae quidem omnino coitus, sed tempus arbitror potius quandiu illa non luceret.

Sealiger objected to the interpretation of Politian on the ground that Troy was captured in the night of the full moon. The principal editors of Vergil, however, until the first edition of Forbiger in 1837, interpret *luna* as the equivalent of *nox*. These include Schrevelius, Rucaeus, Burmann, Valpy (who thinks the moon was in its last quarter), Heyne (whose opinion is favored by Conington, though he does not commit himself outright), Cooper, Peerlkamp, Häckermann in a review of Wagner's 1861 edition,<sup>5</sup> and Lejard. This interpretation appears to have been in Dante's mind also when he wrote "Dove il sol tace" (*Inferno* i. 60) and "loco d'ogni luce muto" (*ibid.* v. 28).<sup>6</sup>

Forbiger says that the silence of the night and the splendor of the moon favored the stratagem of the Greeks, but in his 1852 edition he confesses that

<sup>3</sup> Donatus evidently thinks the moon was shining at vs. 255, but the rest of this note, especially the sentence in his note on vs. 360, "luna probatur inlustre atque ita ut in diem quoque durare potuisset," implies that he has in mind a moon in the last quarter.

<sup>4</sup> *Angeli Politiani miscellaneorum centuria* (Lugduni, 1550), c. 100, 642.

<sup>5</sup> *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* (Berlinischer Gymnasiallehrer-Verein), XIX (1865), 55.

<sup>6</sup> Professor J. N. D. Bush, who was the first to suggest to me the interpretation of *silentia lunae* defended in this article, offered both of these passages in support of his firmly held conviction that the moon was not shining. Professor C. H. Grandgent, in reply to my letter of inquiry, wrote November 11, 1934: "Your inquiry about *dove il sol tace* interests me very much, and I think the Virgilian reference is altogether likely. I doubt very much whether Dante knew the passages from Cato or Columella. He knew a little, but probably not much, from the elder Pliny."

but for the tradition that Troy was captured on the night of the full moon, he would have preferred Politian's interpretation.

The principal protagonists for the interpretation that the moon was shining at verse 340 are Henry, who defends his position on purely subjective grounds, and Ladewig in his 1857 and in all his subsequent editions, Benoist, and Richard Heinze<sup>7</sup>—all of whom insist that Vergil was following the post-Homeric tradition. Heinze argues that Vergil is juxtaposing the darkness of the night with the brightness of the moon as in the Nisus episode (ix. 373). When he comes to verses 360, 397, 420, and 621, he declares: "In diesen Szenen erwähnt daher Virgil wiederholt die 'Schatten der schwarzen Nacht'; da sie in den engen Strassen der Stadt spielen, kann er das natürlich trotz des Mondscheins."

Like the other traditionalists, Heinze cites as a parallel Horace *Carm.* ii. 8. 10, "tacitura noctis signa," but *signa* does not necessarily include the moon and *tacitura* may well be a case of hypallage. Another supposedly parallel passage cited by Heinze, Ladewig, and Benoist is Statius *Theb.* ii. 58, "per Arcturum mediaeque silentia Lunae." This verse may well have been inspired by the Vergilian phrase under discussion. Müller's text has a footnote, "cf. *Aen.* II, 255." A more likely source in my opinion is Ovid *Met.* vii. 184, "Fertque vagos mediae per muta silentia noctis." Granted, however, that Heinze, Ladewig, and Benoist are right, what do they prove? Surely a possible interpretation and, in my opinion, the correct one is that of Valpy,<sup>8</sup> "Medium noctem et intempestam designat, quia tunc omnia silent sive tacent," and of Häckermann,<sup>9</sup> "Wenn aber Ladewig auf Stat. *Theb.* II, 58 . . . hinweist, so genügt es zu bemerken, dass Statius dort wie *Silv.* V, 4, 7, *Theb.* VI, 289 luna für *nox* sagt, was schon das Epitheton *media* deutlich beweist." Finally, in speaking of the post-Homeric tradition, Heinze says:

Unter Späteren weiss davon nur Petron in der *Troiae halosis* v. 54:

iam plena Phoebe candidum extulerat iubar.

This poem, however, which occurs in chapter lxxxix of the *Satyricon*, is closely modeled on *Aen.* ii. 13–267, of which it "forms a kind of abstract,"<sup>10</sup> but it does not reproduce everything that is in the Vergilian passage, nor does the fact that the moon is obviously full in Petronius mean that he thought it was full in the Vergilian passage.<sup>11</sup>

None of these passages just quoted seems to me to support the contentions of the scholars who adduce them. A very striking parallel on the other side, however, is given in Peerlkamp's note in support of his contention that *luna* = *nox*. Paulinus Nolanus (*Carmen* xv. 256) has

Angelus et tacitae per amica silentia noctis  
Lux et iter Felicia erat,

<sup>7</sup> *Virgils Epische Technik* (Berlin, 1915), pp. 24 and 25.

<sup>8</sup> Ed. in *Delphini usum* (London, 1824), II, 58.

<sup>9</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>10</sup> H. E. Butler, *Post Augustan Poetry* (Oxford, 1909), p. 130.

<sup>11</sup> See also Teuffel-Schwaabe, § 305, 6, and Butler, *op. cit.*, p. 131, n. 1.

on which Peerlkamp's comment is: "Eum sic in Virgilio legisse diceres. Et hoc erat melius quam Lunae." At all events, this line and verse 241, "fugit atri carceris horror" (cf. *Aen.* ii. 754-55), and verse 266, "Carceris et noctis reliquis obscura sed uni," would suggest that Paulinus had Vergil in mind.

This post-Homeric tradition that Troy was captured on the night of the full moon rests principally on a verse from the *Little Iliad* of Lesches, *νῦξ μὲν ἔην μέσση, λαμπρὰ δ' ἐπετέλλε σελήνη*, which Heinze correctly translates "Mitternacht war's: hell ging der Mond auf ['Twas midnight and the bright moon was rising]."<sup>12</sup> The full moon does not rise at midnight, however, as everyone knows, but at sunset. The moon in the last quarter, however, does rise about midnight—actually about 1:00 A.M. in May—and sets after sunrise. The scholium to Euripides' *Hecuba* 910, which preserves this verse, states:

Καλλισθένης ἐν β' τῶν Ἐλληνικῶν [Frag. 15] οὕτως γράφει· ἔάλω μὲν ἡ Τροία Θαργηλίων μηρὸς, ὡς μέρι τινες τῶν ιστορικῶν ιβ ισταμένον, ὡς δὲ δ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα ἡ φθίνοντος δούριει γάρ αὐτὸς τὴν ἀλωσιν φάσκων συμβῆναι τότε τὴν κατάληψιν ἥρκα. νῦξ μὲν ἔην μέσση, λαμπρὰ δ' ἐπετέλλε σελήνη<sup>13</sup> μεσονύκτιος δὲ μόνον τῇ δύσῃ φθίνοντος ἀνατέλλει, ἐν διλλοι ὥ. (ἢ) σύμπειφώντην Ελειπίδης ὡς ὁμολογουμένης τῆς δόξης.

According to the author of the *Little Iliad*, therefore, Troy was taken at midnight in the second part of the month (*μηρὸς φθίνοντος*) and there was a moon. As the Greek month was a lunar month, the implication is that the moon was waning.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus<sup>14</sup> and Plutarch<sup>15</sup> give the same information, but do not mention the *Little Iliad*. Clement of Alexandria<sup>16</sup> gives the fullest account of the time of the capture of Troy, but states:

τινὲς τῶν τὰ Ἀττικὰ συγγραψαμένων δύσῃ φθίνοντος, βασιλεύοντος τὸ τελευταῖον ἔτος Μενεοθέως πληθούσης σελήνης. "νῦξ μὲν ἔην (φησὶν δ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα πεποιηκώς) μεσάτη, λαμπρὰ δ' ἐπετέλλε σελήνη."<sup>17</sup>

As these passages show, there were two traditions regarding the capture of Troy. According to one, Troy was captured during the first part of the month, that is, when the moon was waxing. The other, which has the support of all four authorities just cited, although Clement contradicts himself,<sup>18</sup> is that Troy was captured in the last part of the month, that is, when the moon

<sup>12</sup> The Scholium *ad Lycophron Alexandra* 344 mentions the place in the *Little Iliad* where this line occurs.

<sup>13</sup> *Ant. Rom.* i. 63.

<sup>14</sup> *Vit. Camill.* xix. 4-5.

<sup>15</sup> *Strom.* i. 381.

<sup>16</sup> If I am correct in my interpretation that *μηρὸς φθίνοντος* (the last division of the month) is synonymous with or at any rate coexistent with a waning moon, Clement contradicts himself in the phrase *πληθούσης σελήνης*, which means a growing moon (cf. *Od.* xviii. 484). Certainly it does not mean a full moon as Wilson translates it in Vol. IV of the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library."

was on the wane. The Euripides scholiast states definitely that this was the view of Lesches, and though this line from the *Little Iliad* can be made to apply to any phase of the moon, it seems reasonable to suppose that he was one of the sources used by the historical writers mentioned by the scholiast, by Dionysius, Plutarch, and Clement.

The interpretation that the moon was waning when Troy was captured receives further support from the "doctrine of lunar sympathy" characteristic of early peoples.<sup>17</sup> The tradition is well known that the Spartans arrived too late for the Battle of Marathon because they made it a rule never to march out to war unless the moon was full.<sup>18</sup> If the Spartans would not start on a military expedition unless the moon was full, their military operations would necessarily be carried out while the moon was waning. Is it pressing this doctrine too far to say that the thought in the mind of Lycurgus and that back of the post-Homer tradition concerning the capture of Troy is that contained in the following statement?

Again, the waning of the moon has been continually recommended both in ancient and modern times as the proper time for felling trees, apparently because *it was thought fit and natural that the operation of cutting down should be performed on earth at the time when the lunar orb was, so to say, being cut down in the sky.*<sup>19</sup>

Apart from the question of the post-Homeric tradition which Vergil may have followed, it is surprising that editors have paid so little attention to this use of the phrase, *luna silens*, by the agricultural writers from Cato on to mean "the dark of the moon." This phrase usually refers to the interlunium, that is, the night of the new moon when its dark side is entirely turned toward the earth. E. Tavenner<sup>20</sup> has collected many instances of this in his article on the doctrine of lunar sympathy among the Romans. Among these may be mentioned Cato *RR* xxix. 40. 1 and 50. 1; Pliny *NH* xviii. 314, 318, and above all xvi. 190: "Inter omnes vero convenit utilissime in coetu eius sterni, quem diem alii interlunii, alii silentis lunae appellant." Politian, however, who makes this use of *luna silens* by agricultural writers the backbone of the argument contained in his note already cited, maintains that of course Vergil cannot be referring to the interlunium because of the *oblati per lunam* of verse 340. He says: "pro minime *tum lucente acceperim.*" Tavenner presents an inter-

<sup>17</sup> See J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (London, 1914), Vol. II, chap. viii and ix, esp. p. 141.

<sup>18</sup> Herod. vi. 106; Paus. i. 28. 4; and of particular interest pseudo-Lucian *De astrologia*: Λακεδαιμονίοισι δὲ Αιγαῖοργος, τὴν πολιτηρὶν τάσσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διετάξατο καὶ νόμους σφίσιν ἐπαήσατο μηδαμὰ μηδὲ ἐς πόλεμον προχωρέειν πρὸς τὴν σεληναῖην πλήρεα γενέσθαι. οὐ γάρ, ἵστη ἐνδιμίζειν εἰναὶ τὴν δυναστεῖην αἴξανομένης τῆς σεληναῖης καὶ ἀφανίζομένης, πάντα δὲ ὑπὸ αὐτῆς διουκέσθαι.

<sup>19</sup> Frazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-36. The italics are mine.

<sup>20</sup> "The Roman Farmer and the Moon," *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, XLIX (1918), 67 ff. I am indebted for a knowledge of this excellent article and for many other helpful suggestions and criticisms to my colleague, Professor M. B. Ogle.

esting passage from Columella<sup>21</sup> to prove that this phrase may refer to the moon in the last quarter (the phase, I believe, Vergil had in mind throughout his description of the taking of Troy):

Silente luna fabam velito ante lucem. Deinde cum in area exaruerit, confestim, priusquam luna incrementum capiat, excussam refrigeratamque in granarium conferto. Sic condita a curculionibus erit innoxia.

Here it is apparent that the dark of the moon is thought of as the remnant of the waning moon; and that if the moon should begin to increase before the harvest was garnered, the beans would not dry successfully.

To conclude, the majority of the commentators on Vergil believe that *luna = nox* in Aen. ii. 255. These include Servius, who believes that the moon was in a quarter-phase, presumably the last, and offers this as one of two possible interpretations. Donatus clearly implies that the moon was in its last quarter, although giving *aliquid luminis* at verse 255. Politian appears to have in mind a moon in its last quarter and states definitely that it was not shining when the Greeks came from Tenedos.

Forbiger (who would prefer Politian's interpretation but for the tradition that the moon was full when Troy fell), Ladewig, Benoist, and Heinze insist that the moon was full and shining at verse 255 because of their misinterpretation of the post-Homeric tradition followed by Vergil. Papillon and Haigh, without adequate justification; Mackail, with some uncertainty in his mind; and Henry, on purely subjective grounds —all believe that the moon was shining at verse 255.

There was, then, a definite post-Homeric tradition<sup>22</sup> based on one line of the *Little Iliad* of Lesches which affirmed that Troy was captured at midnight when the moon was waning, and Vergil very likely had this in mind; but, in considering Vergil's use of his sources, one should always bear in mind the words of Conington:

Virgil imitated Homer, but imitated him as a rival, not as a disciple; his object was not to give a faithful interpretation of his great master, but to draw forth his own genius and satisfy the age in which he lived; and accordingly he modified the Homeric story [which I take it includes the post-Homeric story] at his pleasure, according to the thousand considerations that might occur to a poetical artist, a patriot, and a connoisseur of antiquarian learning.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> ii. 10. 12 (p. 70 of Tavenner's article).

<sup>22</sup> There may also have been tradition that Troy was captured on a dark night. No moon is mentioned in Book xiii of the epic of Quintus Smyrnaeus, although he does mention a moon earlier in the poem. The question of his sources is a vexed one, but Way's statement ("Loeb Library" [1913] Introd., p. vii) is sufficiently conservative: ". . . It has been assumed that the work of Quintus is little more than an amplification or remodelling of the works of these two Cyclic Poets [Arctinus and Lesches]. This, however, must needs be pure conjecture."

<sup>23</sup> II, 28.

Finally, apart from the opinion of the majority of the editors, apart from the fact that Vergil's account is in accord with the post-Homeric tradition, is it conceivable that when the expression *luna silens* has been used by Italian farmers as early as 200 B.C. to mean "the dark of the moon," Vergil should have expected his readers to understand this phrase to mean a "quiet moonlight night"?

If there be any so literal-minded as to be troubled by the darkness dwelt on in those parts of Book ii which describe the fall of Troy except verse 340, so that they might think with Mackail that "if the moon was at her first quarter, she would be setting at 360 and would have set before 397," let them fall back on the explanations of Donatus, or those of Heinze, "Da sie [Schatten] in den engen Strassen der Stadt spielen, kann er das natürlich trotz des Mondscheins," or the warning of Henry to avoid "that great and fundamental error . . . of taking figurative and poetic for literal and prosaic. . . ."

ROBERT V. CRAM

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

#### DIONYSOS ELEUTHEROS AND LIBER

The Phrygian provenance of Dionysos is well attested. In the *Bacchae* of Euripides the chorus is exhorted to bring the god from the Phrygian mountains.<sup>1</sup> Centuries later he is called Phrygian by Nonnos.<sup>2</sup> The Phrygians who worshiped Dionysos were called *Bpolyes* before they passed over into Asia.<sup>3</sup> This earlier form of their name is exactly the same word as the Lydian *briga*, which meant "free."<sup>4</sup> The fact that Hesychios mentions this Lydian word in his gloss on *Bpolyes*, "Phrygians," suggests that his authority, Iobas, had likewise connected the adjective with the proper noun. The passage is as follows: *Iobas δὲ ἐπὸ Λιδῶν ἀποφαλνεται βρίγα λέγεσθαι τὸν Ἐλεῖθερον*, whence it is clear that *Bpolya* is the accusative form. The Phrygians were then "the Freemen," and their national god was the Phrygian or "the Freeman." This ethnic title with its original meaning of "Free" followed Dionysos in his very early migration to Italy and was there translated "Liber." It also accompanied the god into Attica, where at Eleutherae and Athens it was translated 'Ελεῖθερος or 'Ελευθερέως. The eastern and Phrygian origin of the cult of Liber is perhaps confirmed by the participation of his priests in the *taurobolium* of the Phrygian goddess Cybele.<sup>5</sup>

The epithet *Eleutheros* is not the only contribution of the northern Diony-

<sup>1</sup> *Bacchae* 85-86.

<sup>2</sup> *Dionysiaca* xi. 117.

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus vii. 73.

<sup>4</sup> Hesychios, s.v. *Bpolyes*.

<sup>5</sup> *CIL*, XII, 1567.

sos to Attic proper names. Alopeke, the name of one of the Athenian demes, is another. It means "fox skin." The fox skin played a very important part in Dionysiac cult, in which it was a ritual garment worn by the Thracian Bacchae. The Thracian name for the fox skin was *βαστάρα*, from which Dionysos received the title "Bassareus." A Lydian garment also Dionysiac was known by the same name.<sup>6</sup> The significance of the fox skin for the Bacchae is quite clear. It made possible a closer identification of the Bacchant with her god, as did the bull skin worn by the priestess of a bull god in the mystic scene on the sarcophagus of Hagia Triada. The fox was the theriomorphic Dionysos and may be such on the early electrum coins which are assigned to Lydia.<sup>7</sup> A close relationship of the fox to Dionysos at Thebes is established by the story that it became the bane of the city in consequence of the wrath of Dionysos.<sup>8</sup> The choice of the fox as the animal embodiment of the god of the vine may have been due to the fondness of the fox for grapes, as is shown by the fable of Aesop.<sup>9</sup> For this reason in all probability the name *ἀλωπέκεως* was given to a certain vine and the wine produced from it.<sup>10</sup> The name may even have originated in the deme of Alopeke if that deme was rich in vineyards. The approximate position of this deme is known from a statement by Herodotos that the grave of the Spartan Anchimolios was in Alopeke and near the Kynosarges of Herakles in the deme of Diomeia.<sup>11</sup> The propinquity of the two demes may have reflected the close association of Herakles and Dionysos, who were the Theban sons of Zeus. Alopeke was a deme of the tribe Antiochis, named from Antiochos, the son of Herakles. When Theseus urged Herakles to forsake Thebes for Athens,<sup>12</sup> Dionysos may have accompanied his half-brother and have brought to Attica the names *Bούρα* and *Βαστάρα*, the first of which yielded the title of the Dionysos of the early temple and theater on the south slope of the Athenian acropolis, while the second name was translated *'Αλωπεκή* and was used to designate a deme which originally

<sup>6</sup> Aischylos *Edon.*, frag. 59; Pollux vii. 59.

<sup>7</sup> Illustrated in Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art*, V, 289, Fig. 188. The early Hellenistic coins of Alopekonnesos on the Chersonese associate the fox with Dionysos by placing the head of the god on the obverse and a fox with grapes on the reverse ("Thrace," *British Museum Catalogue*, p. 188). On *βαστάρα* see Eisler, *Orph. Dion-Mysteriengedanken*, p. 110.

<sup>8</sup> Paus. ix. 19. 1. This fox, when about to be caught by a dog which Artemis gave to Procris, the daughter of Erechtheus, was turned to stone along with the dog. The Theban fox thus narrowly escaped the "Erechtheid" dog. The latter may be commemorated by the fine marble hound of the late archaic period which was discovered on the Athenian acropolis (figured in Schrader, *Arch. Marm. Sculp.*, p. 78). He is represented about to spring upon the fox(?)

<sup>9</sup> *Fabulae* 33.

<sup>10</sup> Hesychios, s.v.

<sup>11</sup> v. 63.

<sup>12</sup> Eurip. *Herc. Furens* 1323.

may have been closely grouped with the temple area in commemoration of the conquest of Athens by the Phrygian national god.

G. W. ELDERKIN

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

---

ANTH. APP. PLAN. (XVI). 54. 2

Θῦμον ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ πνεύματι θεῖς ὄνυχα

Mr. Lumb (*Notes on the Greek Anth.*, p. 99) remarks: "θεῖς ὄνυχα is grotesque," a sentiment with which all who have devoted any thought to the matter are disposed to agree. But he then suggests γύμνα τ' θεῖς ὄνυχι, a phrase scarcely less strange than the words he would replace (AP xiv. 19 is not a parallel). Of the other critics, Jacobs suggested νεῦμα ταθεῖς ὄνυχι; Hecker, νεῦμα ταθεῖς ὄνυχι, comparing xvi. 266. 3; and Scaliger, πνεῦμα τε θεῖς ὄνυχι. Wilamowitz (*Hell. Dicht.*, II, 146 n., and *Hermes* LXV, 255), objecting to Θῦμον as a proper name, wrote οἶμον, ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ πνεῦμα ταθεῖς ὄνυχι. οἶμον may perhaps be right; but surely πνεῦμα ταθεῖς would be preferable: i.e., the artist portrayed you panting as you sped along, straining your powers to the uttermost in the expectation of Olympian victory.<sup>1</sup>

W. HELMBOLD

TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD

<sup>1</sup> For the subsequent misunderstanding of this epigram in antiquity and the story that Ladas died in the moment of victory, see E. N. Gardner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, pp. 284 ff., and Pausanias iii. 21. 1 with Frazer's note. See also E. A. Gardner, *Six Greek Sculptors*, p. 69 n., and Studniczka, *Leipz. Sitz.-Ber.*, 1898, p. 337.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Die Literatur der Römer bis zur karolingier Zeit.* Von DR. ALFRED KAPPELMACHER, Nach dem Ableben des Verfassers beendet von DR. MAURIZ SCHUSTER. Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion M.B.H., 1934. Pp. 485. RM. 42.70.

The present volume is a part of a gigantic enterprise to publish a series of histories of the literatures of the world ("Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft," herausgegeben von Dr. Oskar Walzel, Professor an der Universität Bonn). These volumes have been appearing in parts since 1923, and more than thirty have been completed. Some of them deal with periods of a national literature, others with linguistic groups (Polish, Servian, etc.). For Greek the only representative is the excellent work of Bethe, *Die griechische Dichtung* (1924).

A unique feature of the series is the extensive, one might almost say extravagant, use of illustrations. In the present work there are two hundred and five cuts and seventeen plates, some in colors. While they add much to the attractiveness of the volume, their appropriateness is not always obvious, e.g., a number of (unidentified) landscapes; in some cases they might be confusing, e.g., early Greek vase-paintings in the discussion of the Roman stage. The author has in mind the non-specialist cultivated reader as well as the philologist, but it has not always been easy to strike a balance between the two classes of readers.

In the preliminary section, "Das Entstehen einer römischen Nationalliteratur," the author discusses the various Italic dialects. For the Faliscan a five-word inscription is given, with the Latin equivalent, to show their close relationship. For the Oscan a plate of the cippus Abellanus is reproduced, with a transcription of about a dozen lines, accompanied by a Latin version, and a German translation, with comments on the language and style of the document and the evidence of Roman political influence. Other inscriptions are mentioned and the influence of the Atellanae is discussed. The treatment of the Umbrian dialect follows the same lines; the author warns against the assumption of Etruscan influence in Umbrian prayer-formulas. In the half-page devoted to the Celts, the Greek and Celtic forms for Latin *sequor*, *sequitur*, and *sequimur* are given; reference is made to Celtic contributions to Latin vocabulary and nine Latin writers of Celtic origin are mentioned. Here one feels that the author has said too much or too little. He is more successful in his discussion of the Greeks in Southern Italy, and especially of the Etruscan influence.

The second section, "Die römische Literatur unter griechischen Einfluss," after a preliminary discussion (pp. 49-54) is divided into three chap-

ters. The first contains an excellent sketch (pp. 55-164), "Das Römerum im Ringen mit dem Hellenentum und dem Hellenismus," but the treatment is often uneven. For Plautus we have reproductions of the Ambrosianus (illegible) and the Decurtatus. A page and a half in fine print is devoted to the manuscript problem. A careful analysis (seven pages) is given of the twenty-one scenes of the *Pseudolus*, interlarded with statements of the meters employed, which could have no meaning for the non-technical reader. The nineteen scenes of the *Hecyra* of Terence are analyzed in the same way, with eighteen illustrations taken from the Ambrosianus. The two poets are compared and their treatment of the Greek originals is discussed. Plautus appears as the representative of the "Barok" style while Terence belongs to the "klassischen Hochrenaissance."

The second chapter, "Die Literatur und das Entstehen der griechisch-römischen Kultur" (pp. 165-259), begins with sketches of Polybius, Panaiotis, Poseidonios, and Hermagoras and ends with Lucretius, Catullus, Cicero, Varro, Sallust, and Nepos. The third chapter, "Harmonie und Vollendung" (pp. 260-288), deals with Vergil, Horace, Tibullus, and Propertius.

The remaining sections are "Kaiserzeit," "Die Provinzen," "Das Christentum" (pp. 289-356), "Hellenistische und archaische Strömungen im 2. Jahrhundert nach Chr." (pp. 356-67), "Die Literatur bis zur Merowingerzeit" (pp. 367-439), "Die lateinische Literatur im Zeitalter der Merowinger" (pp. 439-72), and "Der Hof Karls des Grossen" (pp. 472-80). Dr. Schuster's contribution begins with Tacitus (p. 336).

As can be seen, the treatment shows considerable lack of proportion. This becomes more apparent if one notes the amount of space devoted to certain writers in comparison with that found in Teuffel-Kroll-Skutsch. In the present volume Varro has shrunk from 24 pages to 3, Cicero from 75 to 20, Caesar from 14 to 8, Sallust from 13 to 5, Horace from 24½ to 7½, Ovid from 16½ to 6½, Livy from 12½ to 3, Quintilian from 8 to 1½, Pliny the Elder from 8 to 1, Suetonius from 6½ to 2, Apuleius from 10 to 2½, Priscian from 4 pages to 11 lines, and Martianus Capella from 4 pages to 9 lines. On the other hand, Naevius increases from 2½ pages to 7 and Plautus and Terence from 43 to 56.

The author hints at his point of view in a comment on Schanz's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (p. 45), "Es fehlt leider die innere Anteilnahme für die führenden Grossen der römischen Literatur." He has presented to the non-specialist reader a good survey of the entire field with special emphasis on the important figures and movements in Roman literature. The specialist will find much that is stimulating, particularly in the early period. For source material, bibliography, etc., he must still depend on Teuffel and Schanz. The treatment of the MSS, with one or two exceptions, is extremely sketchy. For many writers no mention is made of the MSS; even Cicero is disposed of in a very summary fashion. The reproduction of facsimiles does not furnish a satisfactory substitute.

A few points call for comment: page 44, "Was wir an lateinischen Autoren

erhalten haben, verdanken wir der ersten grossen Renaissance der Antike durch Karl den Grossen und seinen in der Academia Palatina vereinigten Freunden," is too broad a statement; it leaves out of account the contribution of the Irish and Anglo-Saxons to the transmission of Latin texts; page 46, read *Husband* for *Husband*; page 187, the Laudianus of Cicero's rhetorical works was probably older than the twelfth century; page 211, we do not know that the archetype of the MSS of Lucretius was written in Ireland in the seventh century; page 301, read *Korduba* for *Korsika*; page 306, Housman's edition of Manilius should have been mentioned; page 308, of the three items given in the bibliography attached to Paterculus, the first—C. Kempf, 1888—belongs to the bibliography of the following author, Valerius Maximus; in the second read *Bolaffi* for *Bollaifi*, in the third read 82 for 28; for the date of Vat. Lat. 4929 read *aus dem 9. Jh.* instead of *aus dem 10. Jh.*(?); page 350, the statement in regard to the archetype of the minor works of Tacitus needs revision; the MS is not entirely lost. Eight folios of the original survive; its date is ninth, not tenth, century; we do not know that it was brought to Italy by Enoch of Ascoli.

CHARLES H. BEESON

*University of Chicago*

---

*A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages.* By F. J. E. RABY. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. 2 vols. Pp. xii+408 and 388. \$12.50 per set.

Readers of Mr. Raby's *History of Christian-Latin Poetry*, published by the Clarendon Press in 1927, will welcome this new work, which, as the author states in his Preface, is "in some measure complementary to" the earlier volume. The book shows the same format as the earlier work, but, because of its greater bulk, is divided into two volumes; the chapters are, however, numbered continuously throughout the two volumes. The general plan of arrangement, with a division of the material first into large chronological blocks and then into smaller geographical units, is the same—e.g., chapters vii, viii, and ix deal respectively with the French, the Italian, and the German poets of the eleventh century. The two appendixes contain Nigel Wireker's poem, *De fortunae bonis*, from MS Cotton. Vesp. D. xix, folio 2<sup>v</sup>, and a discussion of the text of *Cur suspectum me tenet domina?* from the *Carmina Burana*. There is an extensive and admirably classified Bibliography.

The book reveals the same mastery of a vast amount of material that distinguished its predecessor. The introductory chapters on "The Inheritance of the Middle Ages" and "Poetry of the Rhetorical Tradition from the Fourth to the End of the Fifth Century" give a general survey of Graeco-Roman culture, with emphasis on the influence of the Orient on that culture and the special influence of rhetoric (which Mr. Raby takes to be Asiatic in origin) on Latin poetry. These points are well worth making; but at the same time

it should be remembered that Roman poetry from its very beginnings shows some of the features which we associate with "Asianic" rhetoric: that excellent examples of balance, anaphora, alliteration, and homoioteleuton can be found in the fragments of the Saliar hymns, the sepulchral inscription of the Scipio who was consul in 298 B.C., and the Saturnian verses which the poet Naevius composed for his own tombstone; and that the primitive Roman tried to rid himself of the gout by repeating the jingle:

Ego tui memini,  
medere meis pedibus:  
terra pestem teneto,  
salus hic maneto  
in meis pedibus.

Professor Tenney Frank's *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic* (pp. 140-45) has supplied a valuable corrective to Norden's overstatement of the influence of Greek rhetoric on Roman oratory; it is probable that we should apply a similar corrective to Mr. Raby's thesis of the influence of Greek rhetoric on Latin poetry. As a matter of fact, rhyme (including sporadic cases of end rhyme and internal rhyme) is more noticeable in the verse inscriptions of the common people collected in Buecheler's *Carmina Latina epigraphica* than Mr. Raby's phrase "comparatively rare" would suggest. The rhymes in Claudian's *Epithalamium* may be simply a transfer to verse of an adornment used in rhetorical prose (I, 96); but certainly the rhymes of the rhetoricians would have found a much less fertile soil in Latin poetry if a tendency toward rhyme had not been present from the beginning.

The characterization of the writers of the late classical period in these two chapters is in general good—the recognition of the "great originality" and "pure poetic feeling" of Petronius (I, 31); the remark that the language of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius "stands on the border-line between prose and poetry" (I, 24). One may feel that the discussion of Claudian's "remorselessly competent, hard, and glittering verses" (I, 92) misses some of the real splendor of Claudian's style. But Mr. Raby is undoubtedly right in stressing the rhetorical element in Claudian and other authors of this period—an element so pervasive that it extends even to the speech of annunciation of the angel Gabriel in Paulinus of Nola (I, 66) and to the soliloquy of Satan after the creation of Adam and Eve in Avitus (I, 70).

The next ten chapters of the book trace the history of secular Latin poetry from the sixth through the twelfth century, bringing out both the chronological development and the special contribution made by different nationalities. There is necessarily some overlapping of the field of Christian-Latin poetry; but in general the author (as he says in his discussion of the Latin poetry of Irish origin [I, 162]) concerns himself with religious poetry "only in so far as it represents a stage in the development of rimed and rhythmical poetry." He discusses in some detail the metrical treatise of Virgilius Maro, arguing from the examples there cited that by the sixth century the rhythm

(i.e., a verse form based on equality of syllables in contrast to the classical basis of quantity) had established itself by the side of the older classical forms, so that it "was beginning to find recognition in treatises and to be practised in the schools" (I, 157); that the Irish took over the rhythm in this rudimentary form from the Continental poets and did much to further its development, using sporadic rhyme in the "strange and powerful" *Altus prosator*, and even handling two-syllabled rhyme with skill in some hymns of the *Bangor Antiphonary*; and that the love of rhyme then passed from the Irish to the Anglo-Saxon, and thence back to the Continent (I, 162-64, 225). He notes that the Spanish schools, because of their long connection with Latin speech and Latin civilization, were able to make a special contribution to Carolingian culture (I, 197), and that in Italy, where "both teachers and scholars felt that they were the direct heirs of the classical tradition," a knowledge and appreciation of the old lyric measures lingered in the eleventh century alongside a thorough command of rhythmical verse (I, 366). He recognizes the borrowing by profane poets both of the earlier form of the sequence and of the later, fully developed lyrical form (II, 2-3). There is an interesting statement of the social conditions which produced satire in twelfth-century France (II, 45) and a detailed account of the "Comoedia," or versified tale (II, 54-69).

The historical survey of chapters iii-xii had touched at certain points on the relation between Latin poetry and the vernacular literature. Mr. Raby comments, for instance, on the freshness and vividness of certain Carolingian rhythms which show strong civic or national feeling: the poem celebrating the victory of Pippin over the Avars in 796, the description of the city of Verona, and the *Planctus de Obitu Caroli* (I, 209-13). He notes that the long epic poems written at St. Gall in the late ninth and early tenth century were due to a growth of national feeling and may in some cases have been based on German lays (I, 259-69). He suggests that the description of nature at the beginning of Walafrid Strabo's *Eclogue* had a popular origin (I, 230, n. 1), and assumes the same origin for *Iam dulcis amica venito* (I, 303, n. 1) and *Verna feminae spiriria* (I, 305, n. 1). The last two chapters continue this theme with a discussion of "The Latin Lyric," by which Mr. Raby means the poems arising from the influence of the vernacular, as distinguished from those which carried on the classical tradition. This poetry is discussed in detail, from the songs of Hugh Primas of Orleans and the Archpoet, through the poems of the great lyrical movement of the last half of the twelfth century, to the *Carmina Burana* and other collections of the thirteenth. He concludes (II, 326):

The learned love-lyric had its learned auditors; it had a need to satisfy. We cannot trace its history in the learned tongue throughout the centuries, but it is important to remember one obvious thing. The peoples of Europe did not live without song, and for thousands of years they had their songs of love and of death, their drinking-catches and their ballads. It is the continued flow of this stream of popular poetry, which has now perished as though it had not been, that must be taken into account in any attempt to obtain a reasonable view of the Latin lyric.

The book ends with a suggestion of the problems that still await investigation (II, 332):

Much more remains to be done in the classification of poems, and the study of the dependence of one poet upon another. . . . But until reliable and intelligible texts of the whole corpus of Latin lyrics are available, no comprehensive and decisive study is possible. The task of sorting and, as far as possible, dating the texts can then be attempted. The study of their music is of first importance, especially as regards the relation of the Latin lyrics to the Romance and German lyrics.

These quotations will give some idea of the very readable style of the book. The eye of the present reviewer has not caught many misprints. But in the last paragraph of I, 102, "Philosophy" is surely a slip for "Philologia"; and on page 204 the same shepherd appears both as "Micon" and as "Mico."

CORNELIA C. COULTER

*Mount Holyoke College*

---

*Contexts in Pindar with Reference to the Meaning of φέγγος.* By LIONEL W. LYDE. Manchester University Press, 1935. Pp. xiii+58. 5s.

Gildersleeve (*Pindar*, p. xxxvi) well said that Pindar drained "dry the Greek vocabulary of words for light and bright, shine and shimmer, glitter and glister, ray and radiance, flame and flare and flash, gleam and glow, burn and blaze."

It is no wonder, then, that we have a special book on *φέγγος*, with Introduction and chapters on "Environment," "A Survey," "The Analysis," "The Picture-making," "A Chinese Parallel." There is no Index. The book is by a superannuated professor (emeritus) of geography in the University of London, but he is altogether too modest when he says that though Greek has been his favorite language for sixty years, his knowledge of it has been lamentably meager. Professor Lyde's collection of passages where *φέγγος* occurs is well done, but he often indulges in doubtful parallels and interpretations. I doubt whether "the nearest approach to the combined geographical and historical environment in Pindar's Greece has to be looked for in the Wei valley of China—where the odes of Pindar have something of a parallel in the odes of Confucius." The comments of the geographer on Pindar are ingenious, such as his explanation of Athens "wrapped in violet haze" (p. 4) or his statement (p. 43) that "the soft air of Boeotia made strangers sleepy and so they thought that the Boeotians also must be sleepy and even stupid," but the cone of Santorin (p. 4) was not active in Pindar's day. It is not certain that Pindar was a thorough student of Pythagoras and that (p. 6) "no one who lived in the translucent atmosphere of Greece could have failed to distinguish—by the eye—between the long waves that can penetrate and the short waves that cannot penetrate."

Pindar uses *φέγγος* nine times, and only in four cases is it certainly literal. In most cases Professor Lyde believes that Pindar thinks of it as long-wave,

emotional, multicolored light. He is rather hard on all the translators of the eighth Pythian (p. 37) who "seem to be in general agreement on a version which seems to make poor grammar of the Greek, bad sense in the English, and a surprising failure in craftsmanship by Pindar." In many sections Sandys receives a drubbing. Omar Khayyám's "Shaft of Light" strikes through the darkness and the darkness must be lit up. Pindar is the only poet who uses φέγγος systematically in metaphor. We are even asked to believe (p. 41) that Pindar did

a large proportion of his work under the influence of the emotional light—in the early hours and the late hours of the day; and this conviction is based on a double comparison—a comparison between his short records of the actual exploits of the athletes—and his long stories of the prehistoric heroes—and a parallel comparison between his lavish use of metaphor and his sparing use of simile.

Again, on page 44 we read that "most of Pindar's work was evening work" (it was at sunset that the priest of Apollo invited Pindar into the temple). In the late hours the color strengthens as the scenic details grow dimmer and more mysterious. "Pindar's nature was of the very kind that is stirred to creative activity by the pageantry of glowing color and the tapestry of fading forms."

There is no doubt but that Professor Lyde has read Pindar with his son, listened to lectures on Pindar by Professor Bowra, and been encouraged by Professor Conway to work out a geographical approach to Pindar; but I feel that it has not yet been proved that Pindar was a scientist or an ancient Millikan or Michelson. In any case I let the quotations speak for themselves. For myself I prefer the interpretations of a genuine Greek, Gildersleeve, or a fair-minded Farnell or a wise Wilamowitz or Wade-Gery.

DAVID M. ROBINSON

*Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis, post Fridericum Blass et Guilelmum Suess.*  
Quintum edidit BRUNO SNELL. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1934. Pp. 1\*-  
56\*. RM. 6.20.

This is the most practical text and best condensed account of Bacchylides which has so far been published, as I can testify from the use of Snell's book in my course on Pindar and Bacchylides. I have rarely seen an edition of any author of which it could be so well said that it contained *multum in parvo*. This fifth edition will long be the fundamental book for all students of Bacchylides. It has appeared twenty-two years after the fourth and shows detailed study of the encomia of Papyrus P, but Snell was unable to study, as thoroughly as he would like, the large Papyrus A, to which we owe some twenty poems of Bacchylides. He has benefited, however, by an unpublished manuscript and many notes of Wilamowitz and by the articles of the last twenty years. The Greek text is much improved and includes among the

*Dubia* even the two incomplete dithyrambs published by Vogliano in *Pap. Soc. Ital.*, X (1932), 169–79, although his name is not in the Bibliography. The Introduction is condensed from a hundred to fifty-six pages. Instead of thirty pages on meters, we have sixteen (pp. 18–34) which arrange the meters as dactylo-epitrite, dactylo-iambic, Aeolic, iambic; dactylic, dochmiae, Ionic. The exposition is so clear that only a brief scheme of kolometry needs to be prefixed to each poem. Kenyon's continuous numbers for the poems and fragments, which Blass had changed, are luckily readopted and many uncertain restorations have been discarded. The Bibliography (pp. 50\*–55\*) is now arranged alphabetically instead of topographically. The great Harvard professor of Greek literature is cited as plain Smith instead of Smyth.

The Preface, after a good analysis of the papyri, discusses the study of Bacchylides in ancient days by Plato, who was the only Athenian to read him, by Strabo, Plutarch, Clement of Alexandria, Didymus, Ptolemaeus, Horace, and others down to the Emperor Julian. Then there is an excellent section on the dialect. In one paragraph we are told how Bacchylides drew exhaustively from Homer, and used Hesiod, Solon, Sappho, Mimnermus, Simonides, and Pindar. Pages 34\*–49\* give the contents of the poems and fragments with a good commentary. It is a pleasure to see that Snell knows almost all the literary, linguistic, epigraphical, and archaeological evidence. For example, on page 37\* he says of Bacchylides' version of the Croesus story: "Haec fabula quam jam 40 fere annis antea bene notam fuisse appareat e pictura in vaso Attico depicta, Delphis orta est post mortem Croesi, ne Apollo regem pium proddidisse videretur." Snell (p. 37\*) also knows that Assyrian inscriptions prove that Croesus did not survive the destruction of Sardis in 546 B.C. In his commentary on Carmen 17 (16), which he dates 478–470 B.C., Snell might have referred to the famous cylix by the Panaitios Painter in the Louvre (Furtwängler-Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, Pl. V), which pictures Theseus carried by Triton, not by dolphins, through the sea to Amphitrite, who gives him a purple wreath as in Bacchylides. This cylix dates many years before Bacchylides, so that Jebb (*Bacchylides*, p. 225) is wrong in thinking that in this picture Amphitrite bestows no wreath on Theseus. On the question as to whether the dithyramb 18 (17), with dialogue between the chorus and its leader (Aegeus), could reflect an early form of drama, Snell says only: "Certe non sapit hoc carmen simplicitatem antiquorum dithyramborum e quibus tragoidiam ortam esse constat."

The book closes with the useful ancient "Testimonia vitae atque artis Bacchylidis," an Index Auctorum, and a thirty-page Index Vocabulorum. Though the excellent monograph of Severyns (*Bacchylide* [Liège, 1933]) is listed in the Bibliography, it appeared too late to be thoroughly digested; but it should be used by all scholars in connection with Snell's nice pocket edition, so sane and yet so learned. The Latin may bother some classical scholars who are not accustomed to such forms as *milleni*, *quatenus* (for *qui quidem*) *epigrammatibus*, *literarum*, *literis literas* (many times, but on p. 14 *litteram*,

*littera), and Bacchylides carmina edidit Snell on the cover but Bacchylidis carmina on the title-page.*

DAVID M. ROBINSON

*Johns Hopkins University*

*Arrian: With an English Translation, Vol. II.* By E. ILIFF ROBSON. ("Loeb Classical Library Series.") London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1933.

This volume completes the Loeb edition of the *Anabasis* of Arrian, the first having appeared in 1929. The translation reads easily; but in avoiding the verbosity of Arrian the translator has failed to reproduce to any noticeable degree the flavor of the Greek, and at times the English is little more than a paraphrase.

There are errors in the Greek: *κα* for *καὶ* (v. 1. 6); *ἄγνοια* for *ἀγνοίᾳ* (v. 13. 2); *ἄλλου τοῦ* for *ἄλλου τοῦ* (v. 20. 6); *τινα* for *τίνα* (vii. 18. 2); *ἐστιν* for *ἔστιν* (*Ind.* xl. 9).

Many passages occur where the translation has omitted what is in the Greek, or is misleading, or altogether wrong. *Περσίς*, the satrapy of Alexander's empire, which was the ancient district of Anshan, is consistently translated "Persia," although the Index has the *lemma*, "Persis, a part of Persia." *Πασαργάδαι* is always "the Pasargadae," as if it were a tribe instead of the city by that name as it is shown on the map accompanying the volume, and even in the sequence "to Babylon or to the Pasargadae or to Susa" (vii. 19. 2). *ἐπὶ πολὺ τῆς νυκτὸς* (v. 13. 3) is "all night"; *ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν κατακλεισθέντων* (vi. 6. 3), "fled into the city"; *στρατηγοί* (vi. 27. 3), "satraps," although there is no evidence in any other writer that the men mentioned were any more than "generals." "Sailing among the desert places of Arabia," for *πλεύσαντας ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀραβίας τὰ ἔρημα* (vii. 20. 10), is wrong, as is "offered to the customary gods sacrifices" for *τεθυκὼς τοῖς θεοῖς τάς τε νομιζομένας θυσίας* (vii. 24. 4). *πεζῷ ἄγειν Λεοννάτῳ ἔδωκεν* (*Ind.* xxiii. 8) is more than "he handed over to Leonnatus," and *κατὰ νέα τε δέπτοντο ἐποίεοντο* (*ἐδειπνοποιέοντο*) Roos, Chantraine; *Ind.* xxvii. 6) is not "each ship took its own meal." "Moving his cavalry around [Alexander] rested his infantry" for *ἐς κύκλους παριπεύων ἀνέπαυε τοὺς πεζοὺς* (v. 16. 1) is nonsense. *τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Μακεδόνων* (vii. 9. 5) is more than "all Macedonia"; *προσπλάσαντας* (*Ind.* xxxix. 4) is not "sailed past"; *στρατὸς* (*Ind.* xlvi. 10) is not "navy." Little better than paraphrases are "towards further progress" for *ἐς τοὺς πρόσω πινδόνους* (v. 28. 1); "the other part he handed over to Perdiccas" for *τὸ δ' ἔτερον Περδίκκας προσήγε* (vi. 9. 1); "when his fleet had sailed from India to the Persian Sea" for *περιπεπλευκότος* (*sic*) . . . *τοῦ ναυτικοῦ τὴν ἀπ' Ἰνδῶν γῆς εἰς Πέρσας θάλασσαν* (vii. 10. 7), and "Persian Sea" is of course wrong. *οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Πῶρον* (v. 14. 2) is no more than "Porus"; so also in vi. 27. 4. *τοὺς . . . ἀμφὶ Κλέανδρον τε καὶ Σιτάλκην* is only "Cleander and Sitalces."

There is no translation of the sentence beginning *οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ* (*Ind.* xv. 12), of *κατπερ κακῶς ἔχων* (vi. 10. 2), *ἐξ Ἀλεξάνδρου* (*Ind.* xxiii. 5), *ἐσ τὰ πλεόμενα* (*Ind.* xli. 4). "Hydaspes" faces *Τὸραώτης* (v. 21. 5), "Thracians" faces *Θεσσαλῶν* (vii. 9. 4); "thirty-three" should be "twenty-four" (*Ind.* xxi. 13). Entire consistency in translation is not altogether desirable, and so possibly it is admissible to render *ὦ βασιλεῦ* as "Sir" (v. 27. 2; *Ind.* xxxv. 6), "King" (*Ind.* xxxvi. 5), and "O King" (*Ind.* xx. 5); but was Arrian's (and Nearhus') geography so vague or their orientation so varied that *μεγάλη θάλασσα* should be translated in as many ways as "Great Ocean" (vi. 1. 5, 19. 5), "ocean" (vi. 19. 1, 20. 2, 21. 1; vii. 5. 6, 16. 2), "Indian Ocean" (vii. 10. 7), "great sea" (vii. 16. 2; and also "ocean" in the same sentence), "Ocean" (vii. 20. 10; *Ind.* iii. 2; xix. 9), "Great Sea" (*Ind.* xlivi. 2)? When the Indians maintain that the Heracles whom the Greeks claim was in fact *γηγενέα* (*Ind.* viii. 4), is the Loeb reader to credit the Indians with a pun when the translation runs that Heracles "was called by the Indians themselves 'Indigenous'"? The pedantic "Carchedon" in v. 27. 7; vii. 1. 2 becomes the well-known "Carthage" in *Ind.* xlivi. 11; "Lagus," elsewhere, becomes "Lagos" in *Ind.* xviii. 5. The often emended passage in vi. 26. 2 takes a new form with *θυλάκῳ* in place of the *οὐ χαλεπῷ* of the manuscripts, but it is translated as if *χαλεπῷ*, not *θυλάκῳ*, stood in the text.

In the Introduction to the first volume the author disavowed any emendations, "since emendation belongs rather to a text which is impossible or difficult to translate as it stands, than to a text which may merely lack finish or precision" (p. ix). Consequently *ἐπιτηδέως* stands in the passage (*Ind.* xl. 3): *τὸ δὲ ἐπιτηδέως* (*ἐπὶ τῷδε* Roos, *ἀπὸ τοῦδε* [Hercher, Chantraine]) *πρὸς ἄρκτον τε καὶ Βορέην ἀνεμον ἴσντων καλῶς κεκράσθαι τῶν ὥρεων*. Robson's translation of this passage, "Then the next zone, northward, has a temperate climate," may be compared with Chantraine's "Quand on s'avance au Nord de cette zone, dans la direction d'où souffle le vent Borée, le climat est tempéré." Also *Ind.* v. 3 stands *συγγενέσθαι γὰρ Σανδρακόττῳ λέγει* (sc. *Μεγασθένης*), *τῷ μεγίστῳ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ἰνδῶν, καὶ Πώρῳ, ἐπὶ τούτου μέζονι*, although it is utter nonsense to call one man the "greatest" king in India and in the same breath to name another "greater" than he. Surely either the emendation of Schwanbeck, adopted by Roos and Chantraine, should be accepted—i.e. *καὶ Πώρου ἐπὶ τούτῳ μέζονι*—or *καὶ . . . μέζονι* should be deleted as a gloss (cf. O. Stein in *P.-W.*, XV, 234). Again, Roos's emendation of *τῆς τροφοῦ* for *τοῦ ὅρεος* (*Ind.* i. 5), based as it is on v. 1. 6, certainly deserves consideration. Speaking generally, is it reasonable to dismiss practically all scholarship since the days of Dübner in so cavalier a fashion?

Unique in current editorship, we trust, is what appears to be the use of brackets both for words added (e.g., vi. 26. 5; *Ind.* ii. 6) and for passages which should be deleted (vi. 15. 5). An examination of the *apparatus criticus* of Roos for *Ind.* xxxvii. 2 leads to the conclusion that Robson's brackets in that passage are a plain blunder.

A few minor typographical errors should be noted: page 25, note 1, "36" for "86"; page 385, line 1, "an" for "and"; page 423, line 10, "Then" for "There."

Could there not have been a few more notes to help the "general reader" of the Loeb series? Dates would have been most appropriate at v. 19. 3 and vii. 28. 1. When Arrian says (*Ind.* xl. 2) that a part of Persis lies on the "Red Sea," there is no explanation of "Red Sea," not even in the Index. Not a word to explain how such a statement could have been made as that Hanno, after passing out through the Strait of Gibraltar, sailed east for thirty days, with Africa on his left (*Ind.* xlivi. 11), although explanations have been offered by modern scholars. In the Index, nowhere else, Megasthenes is described as "a writer, respected by Arrian."

Here and there are felicitous renderings, such as he "would have cause to rue the sight" for *οὐ χαρήσει ἤδην* (v. 20. 6), but on the whole the volume leaves the impression of having been done carelessly and indifferently.

C. H. OLDFATHER

*University of Nebraska*

---

*A Biography of the Greek People.* By CECIL FAIRFIELD LAVELL, Professor of the History of Thought in Grinnell College. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934. Pp. xiii+297. \$3.00.

In the present case the author's own title furnishes a better indication of the contents of his work and of its approach to Greek civilization than the title of the book itself. If it is remembered that no single volume, no matter how able the author, can do justice to all phases of Greek life, and if the volume is read for what it is, a history of Greek thought with some account of the background against which this thought was produced, it will be found valuable and interesting. Yet even as a history of thought, in spite of its inclusiveness, it contains certain flaws. On one important point the author shows that he has been guilty of the mistake, not unusual with students that concentrate on great writers, of failing to understand what a very common word meant to the ordinary man of the time. The incorrect statement on page 194 concerning the Peace of Antalcidas is not due merely to an insufficient knowledge of the confused history of the fourth century but also to a failure to understand that autonomy, according to the ideas of the time, was reconcilable with membership in such organizations as the Peloponnesian League and the Second Athenian League, which was organized later without violating the terms of the Peace. No words cause more trouble in Greek and Roman history than "freedom" and "autonomy." There is food for thought in the fact that the Roman jurist, Proculus, defined "freedom" in such a way that a state which is the subject ally of another still is considered free (*Digest* xlvi. 15. 7). This definition is Roman and late, but it is not unlikely that a similar definition was implied when Sparta forced Athens to accept a treaty

in which she promised to have the same friends and enemies as the Lacedaemonians and to accept their leadership in war (*Xen. Hell.* ii. 2. 20). For an example of a Hellenistic document combining theoretical freedom with actual subjection see *Rivista di filologia*, LVIII (1930), 472. Here a rather technical point is involved. It is worse that the "political animal" of Aristotle is allowed to appear on page 268 without any adequate statement concerning what *πολιτικὸν ζῷον* actually means.

Thus the chief fault of the book is that not only the title but also the author's statement of his purpose given in the Preface are overambitious. This lays him open to the criticism that the account of political institutions and history are inadequate, that there is not enough concerning the economic life, that science has been treated too superficially, and that important but less spectacular phases of Greek thought have been neglected. Thus Hippocrates, Isocrates, Pasion, and Aristarchus of Samos are omitted. Yet if it is to be judged by its positive rather than its negative qualities, it should be given a rather high rating. It is well planned and well written, and the judgment of the author is often acute and stimulating.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

*University of Chicago*

---

*Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen und althellenischen Gesetzgebung.* By MAX MÜHL. (*Klio*, Beiheft XXIX.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1933. Pp. 107. M. 7.50, bound M. 9.

In the present study the author has presented a readable and interesting comparison between oriental and Greek law. The object is largely to determine whether Greek law is indebted to the older oriental codes. In approaching this problem he is well aware that similarity does not always indicate dependence. Thus, though Hebrew law and Draco both are in advance of Hammurapi in their distinction between intentional and unintentional homicide, this similarity is not thought to be due to borrowing (p. 16). On the other hand, when it is found that the legislation of Zaleucus employed the *lex talionis* in an extreme form otherwise unknown in Greek law, the conclusion is reached that this is due to borrowing from the Orient. On the same point also the Twelve Tables show oriental influence—in this case probably transmitted to Rome through the Etruscans (pp. 19 and 46). Other examples of borrowing are: the distinction made in Greek and Roman laws on house-breaking between crimes committed during the day and crimes committed during the night (pp. 27 f.); Solon's law prohibiting enslavement for debt, which, according to Diodorus i. 79, was borrowed from King Bocchoris of Egypt (pp. 57 f.); the proviso in the law of Gortyn—unique in Greek law—concerning financial recompense in connection with the rejection of an adopted son (pp. 78 ff.). As a whole the borrowing was confined to externals and did not affect the general spirit of Greek law (p. 41).

Such a catalogue of conclusions by no means does justice to the author's presentation, and so it may be well to add that his work can be read easily and rapidly and that an elementary knowledge of Hammurapi and Hebrew law is all that is needed in order to enable the reader to follow the argument. In general, the impression is that Mühl has proved the existence of a certain amount of borrowing, though it is possible—as he himself is aware—to challenge many details of interpretation. For one thing, our knowledge of Greek law is so fragmentary that the *argumentum ex silentio* is particularly dangerous. A fuller knowledge might make the employment of the *lex talionis* by Zaleucus seem less un-Greek. Then, too, the similar provisions of the Twelve Tables might suggest, instead of oriental influence, the preservation of a more severe form of *talio* in Italy than in the rest of the Greek world. Again, it may be dangerous to assume that the proviso of the law of Gortyn cited above was unique. Furthermore, if Cretan reminiscences of oriental law are derived from the Minoan heritage, this would imply a different relationship from the type of borrowing involved in the legislation of Zaleucus or Solon. As for Solon's law against enslavement for debt, there is a decided difference of opinion concerning the value of the evidence of Diodorus. Granting, however, that Solon imitated Bocchoris, as he well may have done, is there any reason for considering the legislation on economic questions of this "business king" (H. R. Hall, *CAH*, III, 277) in close touch with Greek merchants as typically oriental or Egyptian?

Two other points deserve brief mention. When the author compares the ideas of Greeks and Orientals on the subjects of the divine character of law and the perpetuity of law, it is something of a shock to be told that this comparison has not been made before. Obvious as the point is, Mühl's discussion is, therefore, to be welcomed. It is to be regretted that he did not go on to the more difficult question of how, in spite of this conception, laws were so frequently reformed. How was it possible to have Solon's code a few years after Draco? How did it come about that Athens in the fourth century reviewed her laws annually with a view to desirable changes? How did this procedure affect the current ideas of the character of law? Finally, it may be noted that the Appendix, on Hittite law, is of special interest. Two important features are the rarity of the death penalty and the absence of the *lex talionis*. The latter point is particularly noticeable for the reason that the arrangement of the subject matter shows close relationship to Semitic law.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

*University of Chicago*

---

*The Art of the Logos.* By J. A. K. THOMSON. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1935. Pp. 246. 7s. 6d.

So little modern criticism of ancient fiction has been written that this literary study of the foundations of Greek story-telling is welcome. Acknowl-

edging his obligations to Wolf Aly, Schmid and Stählin, and Jacoby, Mr. Thomson proceeds to his theme, "the beginnings of our written tradition" as seen in Herodotus, "the heir of the forgotten masters of narration." Definitions and classifications are the preface to translation and analysis.

The Logos in its original meaning, "what is said," or the oral tale, is considered under the headings: the historical logos; conscious fiction subdivided into the Pseudos, fiction for its own sake, and the Ainos, fable with a moral; unconscious fiction, including the Myth, a logos in the field of religion, the Legend, a logos in the field of history, and the Märchen, or Fairy-Tale. Mr. Thomson himself acknowledges at once that such categories of classification cannot be mutually exclusive, but are based on aspects which "change as you watch them, showing that we have to deal with a thing alive." But this basic classification, illuminated by illustration, enables him to proceed to studies of "The Spirit of the Logos" and "The Art of the Story Teller."

The modernity of Mr. Thomson's appreciations is revealed in his interpretation of the spirit of the Logos from the psychology of the people among whom it arose: their belief in a jealous god, their conviction that the exceptional man is doomed to suffer, their consequent creed of "nothing too much," their "cheerful common sense" even in the face of tragedy, with their conviction that "glorious defeat is more memorable than victory." Such a preliminary study of the psychology of his audience prepares the way for a consideration of the art of the ancient story-teller, for his problem being his audience, a study of his art demands perception of the relation between the Logopoios and his hearers. And essential features of the recited story are found to be clearness in expression and arrangement, simplicity, and a picturesque and dramatic vividness that "makes hearing sight." Natural corollaries of these essential qualities are absence of natural scenery, no psychological analysis, no preoccupation with sex, and an economy of narrative which achieves artistic unity by emphasizing the climax. Other devices which contribute to the unity and vividness of Herodotus' reproduction of the oral story are "definite outlines and clear colours," the use of direct speech, and of simple diction which combines colloquial and archaic words, but is rarely decorated by the flowers of rhetoric which the author could have culled so easily.

In regard to Herodotus' general literary technique in his history, Mr. Thomson points out that the so-called digressions are Homeric in character and form well-ordered parts of that "architectonic" method of building up entire epic or history which must be contrasted with the "bead-stringing" or catalogue style of lesser artists. Indeed, Herodotus' whole history is Homeric in its unity and is written in a style "keyed up to the dignity of the new form" of history, "the grandiose Homeric scheme of it." Mr. Thomson's conclusion is that Herodotus, touched by the tragic spirit of the Attic dramatists of his time, succeeded in his art "in harmonizing the new with the old"; "indeed, what distinguished Herodotus from the Story Tellers before him was just his power of learning from Epic and Drama how to build an ampler structure on

the old foundations. But the foundations come first. This book is a study of foundations."

This outline of the volume, often given in the author's own words, hardly portrays the sensitiveness and delicacy of Mr. Thomson's presentation of the Logoi. By his own discernment he illustrates continually his "cardinal rule of criticism that the critic must put himself as nearly as he can in the position of his author"; "that a man cannot judge well what he will not take the trouble to understand." And his understanding is expressed in the pellucid and beautiful style which he has formed from these early Greek masters through the same passionate devotion which made Dante take Vergil as his guide. Illustrative of both his aim and his success is the concluding paragraph of the Preface:

In translating I have sought to be as literal as possible even, it may be, to the straining of the language. For reasons given in my book there could for me be no Herodotus in modern dress. I have done what I could with that inimitable speech, so deceptively simple, now tragic, now humorous, now eloquent, now colloquial; a quiet-running river of limpid water reflecting all the changeful scenery of its banks, the blue Ionian weather, the stars of an immemorial night.

The richness of illustration in these close, beautiful renderings gives value to the book for all students of the craft of fiction, ancient and modern, as an anthology of primitive Greek stories. And the discriminating appreciation of the story-teller's art, based on a true understanding of the psychological relation between narrator and audience, makes the book a distinguished contribution to the whole history of fiction.

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT

Vassar College

---

*Josephus V: Jewish Antiquities. Books v-viii.* With an English translation by the late H. ST. J. THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1934. Pp. x+812.

While the death of Dr. Thackeray five years ago was a distinct loss to Hellenistic studies, the Loeb Classical Library has been fortunate in securing the services of Dr. Marcus (who is an assistant professor in the Jewish Institute of Religion and a lecturer in Columbia University) to continue the monumental work to which Dr. Thackeray had so enthusiastically devoted himself for some years. In the four volumes of Josephus' work published between 1926 and 1930 Dr. Thackeray brilliantly succeeded in presenting English readers not only with the best critical edition but also with the most accurate translation of Josephus in their language. An inspection of the fifth volume reveals that Dr. Marcus has maintained the same high level of competent scholarship exhibited in the earlier volumes of this series and augurs that in his hands the work still to be done on the remaining three volumes will be ably performed.

The period of Jewish antiquity described in this volume begins with Joshua's invasion of Canaan and ends with Ahab's burial in Samaria. Since the text and the translation of v.-vi. 140 with explanatory notes as far as vi. 60 had been sent to press by Dr. Thackeray, the task of Dr. Marcus has been to revise this portion and to supply the text and the annotated translation of vi. 141—viii, for which he has acknowledged the great aid provided by his predecessor's various papers and notes made available through Mrs. Thackeray's generosity.

As in the earlier books of the *Jewish Antiquities*, the Greek text here presented is based on Niese's (Berlin, 1887), but is eclectic in nature, since the readings assembled in Niese's *apparatus criticus* are occasionally adopted. There is no doubt that from the complex textual condition of these books Dr. Marcus has constructed a text much improved and furnished with the most important of Niese's critical notes. Of the sixteen places in these notes where occurs the name of the Dutch theologian Johannes Cocceius (*al. Coccejus*), in fourteen the editors give the form "Cocceji," but in two (p. 58, n. 3, and p. 354, n. 2) they spell the name "Cocceii."

The translation is somewhat more in the modern spirit than we have been accustomed to find in the earlier volumes, but it is quite accurate and generally lucid. To it are appended explanatory notes which refer the reader to the Jewish tradition, the Septuagint, and the Authorized Version for the variants of biblical names of persons and of places and which elucidate antiquarian and topographical matters by indicating Josephus' inconsistencies, amplifications, divergencies, alterations, errors, and omissions. On page 592, note *a*, 370 liters (dry measure) are equivalent to  $10\frac{1}{2}$ , not 11 bushels, and on page 601, note *c*, 36 liters (liquid measure) are equivalent to  $9\frac{1}{2}$ , not 9 gallons.

In a note on v. 84 (p. 39, n. *h*) the translators identify "Bēthēsana, now called Scythopolis," with the Hebrew Beth-shean, the Septuagint *Baûθσάν*, and the modern Beisan, locating it halfway between Mount Gilboa and the Jordan River, and claim that "of the real or supposed Scythian invasion which gave it its other name nothing is known." While it is true that "at present there is not enough evidence to determine whether there was really a widespread Scythian domination in Syria which lasted for any considerable period," the late Dr. Hogarth, writing in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, III (Cambridge, 1925), 145–46, held that "in the latter half of the seventh century . . . occurred a destructive invasion of all Syria from the north, headed by Scythians," and found that "Scythian elements remained long enough in north Syria to introduce some influences of South Russian culture into Syrian grave-furniture, and, in the south, to give a new name to the old Philistine and Hebrew town of Beth-shan (modern Beisān), the excavation of which may, it is hoped, throw light upon the Scythian occupation." But in accepting Dr. Hogarth's general statement, supported by a few details from Herodotus, Strabo, and Pliny the Elder, and adumbrated in the prophetic writings of Jeremiah and Zephaniah, it must be noted that the Greek name

apparently first occurs in the Septuagint version of Judges 1:27, where we read Βαθσάν ἡ ἐστιν Σκυθῶν πόλις. Whoever the Scythians were and however the imposition of "Scythopolis" upon Beth-shan occurred, it is clear that any attempt to project the Hellenistic name of Scythopolis back into the seventh century is attended with difficulties.

In viii. 53–54 Josephus quotes a letter from King Hiram to King Solomon in which the Tyrian tenders Solomon cedars and cypresses for the Temple in return for grain "of which we are in need because we live on an island" (*οὐ διὰ τὸ νῆσον οἰκεῖν δέδμεθα*). In a note on "island" (p. 599, n. b) Dr. Marcus says "Or 'peninsula'" (*νῆσος* means both), which Tyre really was." The usual Greek word for "peninsula" is *χερόνησος* (*al. χερρόνησος*), but *νῆσος* in this sense seems confined to poetry, for neither Stephanus nor Liddell and Scott nor Sophocles cite a prose-writer in support of this meaning—indeed, Stephanus alone gives this connotation of *νῆσος*. As for Tyre, in antiquity there were two foundations—Palaetyrus on the mainland and Tyrus on an island half a mile opposite. While the community on the coast was held by the ancients to have been anterior to that on the island (hence Palaetyrus) and though this is still the general opinion, it is difficult to determine which was the earlier settlement in view of the results of recent research, which has revealed a long line of suburbs rather than a single city capable of identification with Palaetyrus. However this may be, the ancient coast line has now moved out to the island (doubtless due to the causeway built during Alexander's siege of Tyre), so that the present formation can justly be called a peninsula; but all the extant evidence shows that in antiquity Tyre was built on an island. Therefore, there is no need for *νῆσος* to be interpreted "peninsula."

P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON

*Princeton University*

*Hesperia: Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vol. III (1934).

In No. 1 (pp. 1–128) of this volume, 179 inscriptions, found during the campaigns of 1931 and 1932, are published by B. D. Meritt. There are commentaries of varying length, the longer ones generally dealing with the calendar. Attention may be called to Nos. 7 and 20, where the possibility of a backward count with *μετ' εἰκάδας* is considered without definite conclusion. The inscriptions of great general interest had been published previously, and only real epigraphers will find this series very gripping. It is needless to say that the scholarly quality of the publication is high.

In No. 2 there are three articles. F. O. Waagé discusses some of the medieval pottery found at Corinth, finds that it is identical with pottery discovered at Atlit in Palestine, and reaches the conclusion that this ware, made probably at some Anatolian center, was imported into Italy and served as the pro-

totyp of Italian majolica. Sterling Dow studies the lists of Athenian archontes. There is more literary style than in most epigraphical papers; it is bad. James H. Oliver considers three Attic inscriptions, of the third century after Christ or near it, which contain the word *μουσεῖον*. He makes it probable that the institution so designated is not the famous Museum of Alexandria, but the "University" of Athens, established in such form as to deserve the title under Hadrian and the two following emperors.

Number 3 contains a study, by Virginia Grace, of stamped amphora handles found in 1931 and 1932. The catalogue includes 15 Thasian, 81 Rhodian, 138 Knidian, 71 others. All these are fairly well preserved and are illustrated; a number of others are mentioned. A few pieces of particular interest from the 1933 campaign are also illustrated and discussed. From the evidence of excavation it is inferred that stamped jars were imported from Thasos from *ca.* 400 B.C. through the third century; from Rhodes from *ca.* 300 until late in the second century; from Knidos from early in the third century into, probably, the Roman imperial period. Earlier treatments of stamped handles are cited, so the student is guided to the entire literature of the subject. Miss Grace's article is of outstanding importance, since for the first time the study of this archaeological category is placed on a sound historical basis.

Even more important is Homer Thompson's article in No. 4 (pp. 311-480; 122 illustrations), which deals with pottery from 300 to 100 B.C. During this period the Athenian potters held their home market, in general; thereafter they lost it. Chronology and types are determined solely by the evidence from excavation, which is presented with admirable clarity. There are five deposits, each fairly homogeneous and pretty definitely datable: a well, *ca.* 300 B.C.; a cistern, 325-275; another cistern, 250-200; a pithos, *ca.* 150; and a third cistern, *ca.* 100-86 B.C. Each deposit is examined and catalogued separately, then the results are summarized in discussions of various classes of pottery. The red-figure style, in its final decay, is represented by only two pieces, apparently belonging to the twenties of the fourth century. Black-glaze ware is abundant in all five deposits; the forms and their gradual changes are made clear by both photographs and drawings. To the study of West Slope ware, extending from the last years of the fourth century to the early part of the first, this article is the principal contribution since Watzinger's original treatment in 1901. Thompson finds that Athens is the original and chief center of its manufacture, and makes the interesting suggestion that its decoration was influenced by early geometric pottery which would be found in constructing the foundations of Hellenistic buildings. The numerous fragments of "Megarian bowls" lead to considerable revisions of Courby's chronology and in particular to the conclusion that the bowls decorated with long petals begin in the second quarter of the second century rather than at the beginning of the third. The discussion of lamps is conservative, and Broneer's classification is used as a basis; but here there is archaeological evidence for the succession of certain types. Kernoi, lagynoi, various kinds of plain pottery, fusiform un-

guentaria (for which the conventional term "tear-bottles" might well be retained), and loom-weights are discussed in separate sections.

Thompson points out that his article is not a complete history of pottery, even for the two centuries dealt with. Nevertheless, it takes first place in a bibliography of Hellenistic pottery.

F. P. JOHNSON

*University of Chicago*

---

*Sofocle Aiace: Introduzione e commento di Mario Untersteiner.* Milano: Carlo Signorelli, Editore, 1934. Pp. 321. Paper, L. 10.

The author in the Avvertenza states that this work differs from his preceding commentaries (*Edipo a Colono* [Torino: Soc. Edit. Intern., 1929]; *Elettra* [Milano: Signorelli, 1932]) in that it represents the fruit of his personal investigation into all Sophoclean works in general and not only in the single play under consideration; and also in the fact that the Commentary depends entirely upon the Introduction. He says that it has been his purpose, by his explanations and frequent translations of passages, to enable the young to read the play rapidly. He adopts Campbell's text as being the most faithful to the readings of the manuscript, although occasionally (as he says) departing from it in order to adhere more closely to the codices.

The Bibliography lists fifty-six works, eighteen of which have been published since 1920. The first part of the Introduction treats of Ajax in legend and in poetry. The second part deals with Sophocles' dramatic treatment of the legend. The author stresses the significance of the play as a psychological study of the supreme experience of a very complex personality. The relation of this experience to the individual's character and destiny constitutes the central core of the tragedy. The play is carefully analyzed on this basis, and every important point in the psychological development is treated. There are two hundred and twenty-two notes to this Introduction, the authors most frequently cited being Campbell, Jebb, Wilamowitz, Pohlenz, and Weinstock.

The Introduction is followed by the Greek "argument" of the play, the *dramatis personae*, and a chronological note on the date of composition. The author believes that the *Ajax* is older than the *Antigone*, citing Pohlenz as having especially established this thesis.

The Commentary is full and refers to most of the latest literature on the subject of Greek tragedy in general and of Sophoclean tragedy and the *Ajax* in particular. In the limited scope of a review one can refer only to a few points. In verses 71, 78, and elsewhere *oīros* as being a little loud or rude is not quite clearly enough shown by simply stating that it expresses a tone of impatience. Verse 79: Untersteiner might have corrected the overidealizing comments of Jebb and others on the motive of Athena. Verse 94: Jebb's note is quoted with approval, but there is no correction of his overrefinement

of the meaning of *ἐκεῖνο*. Its meaning, "this," "the following," is a fairly common Greek idiom (cf. Plato *Rep.* 340E and Aeschylus *Per.* 230). Verse 98: The author's note on *Ἄλανθ'* misses the essential point, i.e., that the use of the proper name instead of the pronoun adds a note of defiance. Verse 105: The ironic force of *ἥδιστος* could have been more distinctly expressed. Verses 117-34: The most interesting questions involved—namely, the moral and religious—are not suggested in the notes. Is Athena made a little hateful, as hateful as Euripides would have made her? This would be as important, surely, as notes on grammar and diction. Verse 132: The note on *σώφρονας* is inadequate, especially in view of the characterization in this play. Verse 169: Harry's emendation (*μεγάλαι γυνπῶν*, by which Ajax becomes the eagle instead of the vulture) is worthy of notice (cf. *CP*, VIII, 88-90). Verse 282: The idiomatic force of *γάρ* in a question is not noted. Verse 334: The author does not comment on the colloquial force. Verse 335: The point involved in the military sense of *βοήν* is overlooked. Verse 367: The force of *ἄρα* as showing Ajax's present recognition is not indicated. Verse 386: The idiomatic force of *μηδὲν μέγ' εἰτῆς* as expressing a warning against the *ἔπος μέγα* should have been noted. Verse 473: The real force of the article in *τοῦ μακροῦ βίου* was pointed out by Gildersleeve in *AJP*, VI, 522. Verse 475: Untersteiner quotes Elmsley on Sophocles' obscure style. But Sophocles' style is not obscure, as the late Professor Shorey used to illustrate by citing parallels from Shakespeare, Omar Khayyám, and other poets. Verse 499: The author might have noted the frequent use of *τροφή* in this sense in *Oedipus at Colonus*. Verse 693: *ἔφριξ* is called *aoristo ingressivo*; it is, however, an instantaneous ("dramatic") aorist. Verse 1049: Untersteiner does not mention the metrical effect of the slow insolent movement produced by the foot-endings coinciding with the word-endings. Verses 1067-69: The jingling effect of these verses for rhetorical purposes is not mentioned. Verse 1138: The vague threatening force of *τινι* is not noted. Verse 1226: The force of the initial *σε* to give an insolent tone is not mentioned. Verse 1355: The pathetic force of *ποτ'* is unmentioned. Verse 1366: Untersteiner follows many editors in reading *ἢ πάνθ' ὅμοια*. The cynical tone is not mentioned. Verse 1367: It might have been noted how Odysseus accepts this cynical remark. Verse 1392: The double use of *ἀναξίως* might have been noted and illustrated. Verse 1417: With Lobeck and Seyffert, Untersteiner thinks this verse to be genuine. He might have noted its loose, idiomatic, illogical construction.

The idiomatic force of words or phrases is not noted in verses 282, 367, 585, 586, 843, and 1047. Colloquialisms are apparently unnoticed in verses 581, 591, and 896.

There is a Metrical Appendix, complete and well documented, an Analytical Index in two parts, Italian and Greek, and a Table of Contents.

The book is typographically pleasing, with the commentary at the bottom of each page. The notes are really explanatory, and full in the citation of the more recent authorities. There are very few *lectio variae* and no critical

apparatus, since the primary concern of the author is not textual or even aesthetic criticism but a complete exposition of the meaning of the text for the undergraduate student. This edition of the *Ajax* fulfills its purpose admirably, and everywhere exhibits the fruit of mature scholarship.

F. R. GAY

*Bethany College, West Virginia*

*S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim. Post PIUM KNOELL iteratis curis edidit MARTINUS SKUTELLA. Leipzig: Teubner, 1934.*

Few works of antiquity can claim more manuscripts, editions, and translations than the *Confessions* of Augustine, yet progress toward the settlement of the text has been comparatively slow. The two best-known editions are those of the Benedictines of St. Maur (1679) and of Pius Knöll (*editio maior* in the Vienna corpus, 1896; *editio minor* in the Teubner series, 1898). Knöll's work was based on fourteen manuscripts, including all those of the seventh to tenth centuries known to him, but his chief reliance was on the oldest of these, the Codex Sessorianus (S). Later editors and others have pointed out errors in Knöll's collations, and have protested against his dependence on S. New manuscripts have been discovered, and others more accurately dated, so that the need of a new edition has long been apparent.

The work of preparing such an edition has now been carried out in the most thorough manner. Skutella's collations include: (1) twelve of Knöll's manuscripts, and three others of the seventh, eighth, and tenth centuries; (2) four of the earlier printed editions; (3) excerpts from the *Confessions* found in the works of Eugippius, Bede, and Florus Lugdunensis. Many other manuscripts were examined, and a number are cited on occasion. For the numerous quotations from the Scriptures, comparison is made with the readings of nine ancient psalters, and of the old Latin and Vulgate versions of the Bible.

Unlike Knöll, Skutella does not follow S against all other manuscripts, but whenever any of the others support its readings, it is given the preference. Accordingly, many extremely difficult readings are retained, e.g.:

- Page 2, line 17 (i. 2. 2) non enim ego iam inferi (in inferis edd.)
- 19, 13 (i. 16. 25) ut haberet auctoritatem imitandum verum adulterium (ad imitandum edd.)
- 19, 23 (i. 16. 26) fili (nominative, filii edd.)
- 44, 13 (iii. 6. 10) phantasmatis (ablative, phantasmatis edd.)
- 111, 16 (vi. 8. 13) pervium (per viam, pervius, obvius edd.)
- 129, 30 (vii. 5. 7) ordinata, ut (ordinavit edd.)
- 185, 11 (ix. 4. 7) humiliatis (from humiliare, humiliatis edd.)
- 208, 10 (ix. 13. 36) quaerens quod obiciat (quid edd.)
- 239, 16 (x. 30. 41) in anima mea in carne mea (et in carne mea edd.)
- 239, 21 (x. 30. 41) qua (quae edd.)
- 246, 20 (x. 33, 50) melos omnes (melos omne edd.)

- 251, 14 (x. 35. 55) operata (operta edd.)  
 300, 11 (xii. 10. 10) hunc (sc. fontem) bibam et hunc vivam (hinc vivam edd.)  
 344, 20 (xiii. 18. 22) temporana (temporanea edd.)  
 350, 24 (xiii. 21. 29) et operentur (ut operentur edd.)

Skutella, in fact, in his adherence to the manuscripts, accepts readings which even Knöll abandoned, e.g.:

- 6, 17 (i. 6. 8) veresimilia (veri similia edd.)  
 14, 30 (i. 11. 18) terram per eos (potius Knöll. Skutella's defense of the manuscript reading, p. xxiii, misses the real difficulty of "per eos . . . committere.")  
 18, 11 (i. 14. 23) fet qua† (id quod Knöll)  
 46, 20 (iii. 7. 13) promeridianis (pomeridianis edd.)  
 360, 18 (xiii. 25. 38) debetur (debentur edd.)

The reader feels the need of support for such doubtful  $\ddot{\alpha}\tau\alpha\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\theta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$  and irregularities of gender, form, and syntax as occur in these passages. On the other hand, one notes the frequency with which the readings of S are abandoned, even when well supported, sometimes for no compelling reason, e.g.: 20, 1; 66, 20; 159, 25; 193, 4 (on *fraglare*, cf. *TLL*, VI, 1238, 5 ff., and Souter, *Jour. Rom. Studies*, XVI, 276); 179, 23; 189, 21; 206, 2; 209, 2; 238, 20; 249, 5; 284, 22; 306, 7; 344, 8.

The conjectures of Knöll are generally abandoned, and, in accordance with his conservatism, Skutella rarely offers any of his own. In 155, 9 (viii. 2. 3) his conjecture *spirabat propolis iam* is less apt than Ihm's *spirabat populo Osirim*. Nor is there any need of emendation in 328, 18 (xiii. 1. 1).

Misprints occur on page xxiii, line 5 (the reference is to 244, 7 instead of 247, 7); 243, 21 (add the numeral for sec. 46); 352, 10 (add *tuum*, correct the critical apparatus). Additions should be made to the critical apparatus for 74, 26; 78, 8; 108, 1; 152, 16; 214, 20; 237, 9; 238, 4/5. For the reader who desires to compare the readings of Knöll, their citation would be helpful.

The present generation has witnessed a great advance in patristic studies. In our own country the Catholic University of America has contributed much to our knowledge of the Fathers. The present volume from Germany must be counted as an important milestone along the path of such progress. The completion of the *Thesaurus*, or the publication of *indices verborum* for some of the more important patristic works, would add greatly to our assurance as to many such doubtful readings as have been mentioned in this review.

Skutella has studied under Edward Norden and Werner Jaeger, to whom he dedicates this volume. His name appears in publishers' catalogues as the author of *Die Lingener Abiturienten 1892-1933*. Is he the same as "le P. F. (Père Fridolin?) Skutella, O. F. M., de Berlin" who was in 1929 working on a new edition of the *Confessions* for the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* (Wilmart, *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, II, 257, 260)? Fridolin Skutella also published, in 1928, a *Kurze Einführung in das liturgische Latein*.

In the Preface (p. xxviii) is found an interesting reference to the present status of liberal studies in Germany: "Deinde summae agendae sunt gratiae

Societati auxiliatrici et patronae studiorum litterarum liberalium in Germania  
graviter hoc tempore periclitantium. . . ."

WILLIAM M. GREEN

*University of California*

*La réaction païenne: Etude sur la polémique antichrétienne du I<sup>e</sup> au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle.*

By PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE. Paris: L'Artisan du Livre, 1934. Pp. 519. Fr.  
40.

M. de Labriolle has had a long career as professor in Montreal, Fribourg-en-Suisse, Poitiers, and Paris, and is the author of many substantial works, mostly dealing with Latin Christian literature. The present exhaustive account of the anti-Christian side in the controversies of six centuries is another product of his ripe scholarship.

The leading ideas of the book are summarized in an Introduction of fifteen pages. (1) The pagan arguments are best studied in the works of Celsus in the second century, Porphyry in the third, and Julian in the fourth; but a great deal of less known material is also to be included in any full historical account. (2) The penetration and critical sense of the pagan writers has left few important objections for modern rationalists to add. (3) Their leading mistakes were (a) an underestimate of the intelligence of their Christian adversaries, (b) a failure to appreciate the spiritual power of the Christian faith, and (c) their own religious skepticism, which they could not well admit while defending the religion of the pagan state. The neo-Platonists' attempt to revive pagan devotion was linked with an indiscreet defense of obscene myth and cult. (4) The conflict involved both morals and metaphysics: (a) The Christian spirit weakened the leading values of ancient civilization—unlimited devotion to the state, taste for "honors," respect for the established cult, love of comfort, and pride of life. (b) Christian doctrine opposed creation *ex nihilo* and the incarnation to the Greek postulates of the immutability of the cosmos and the impassibility of the divine. (5) The moral, philosophical, and religious importance of these discussions is obvious. They aroused such passionate zeal on each side that they often rose above the literary verbalism of the time. They represent the most original effort of ancient civilization in the period of its decline.

At a number of points M. de Labriolle deals with controverted questions, e.g.:

Pages 42 f.: The Jewish disturbances in Rome under Claudius, De Labriolle believes, were due to Christian propaganda.

Pages 144 and 285: Origen's statement about the small number of martyrs was written before the great persecutions of the third century, in a passage which stresses God's protection of the Christians. Origen elsewhere states that the martyrs were many—a statement amply confirmed by Porphyry.

Pages 181-87: Philostratus evidently knew the Christian writings, and used them in his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Though intended to be an interesting romance, the work also had a didactic purpose, to support a purified paganism which tended toward monotheism. One may thus suspect that the author's idea was to substitute a "Hellenistic Christ" for the Christ of the church.

Pages 233, 279-81: Harnack, Geffcken, and Bidez are wrong in supposing that Porphyry felt any sympathy or respect for Christ, while attacking the Christians and their "myths." The one passage where a distinction is made between Jesus and his historians is ironical, at the expense of both. The Jesus of the gospels is denounced without mercy, and Porphyry had no means for forming the portrait of any other Jesus.

M. de Labriolle sometimes accepts traditional views without making any reference to modern criticism, e.g.:

Pages 31 and 35: It is assumed that there was a law against the Christians before Pliny's time, whose method of application was fixed by Trajan's rescript. No reference is made to the views of Mommsen, Hardy, etc.

Pages 58 and 189: No question is raised as to the statement in the *Historia Augusta* that Alexander Severus set up an image of Christ, along with others in his *lararium*. For the objections of modern historians cf. Geffcken, *Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, page 13, note 96.

Two of the most important chapters in M. de Labriolle's book are reprinted (with very few changes) from previously published articles—"Celse et Origène," *Revue historique*, CLXIX (1932), 1-44, and "Porphyre et le Christianisme," *Revue d'histoire de la philosophie*, III (1929), 385-440. The book makes no reference to these earlier publications.

M. de Labriolle's respect for Christianity is evident throughout the volume. He notices its best aspects, and reproaches its adversaries for ignoring them. He would be cautious about charging Christianity with borrowing from paganism (pp. 451-54). One might suppose that modern critics of the gospels have no more right than did Porphyry to invent a "historical Jesus" from their fancies (p. 281). But the author never turns apologist, never fails to treat pagan and Christian with equal fairness. To write a book so comprehensive, so scholarly, and so readable is a notable achievement.

WILLIAM M. GREEN

University of California

---

Cicero: "*The Verrine Orations*," Part II, Books iii, iv, and v. With an English Translation by L. H. G. GREENWOOD. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1935.

This volume, like the previous one, abounds in happy turns of expression; as an example might be cited *O tempora, O mores!* "What times we live in!"

Even if here and there one feels that the version fails to reproduce the precise meaning of the original (p. 27, top), or becomes needlessly free (pp. 113 and 311), it is manifest that Mr. Greenwood can translate brilliantly when he chooses. This was not an easy assignment; it is long and tedious and abounds in those Latin terms of abuse that defy sustained freshness and variety. A meticulous student might regret that words like *autem*, *enim*, *vero*, *iam*, *adeo*, and *immo* are often ignored in translating, but it is possible that Mr. Greenwood leans on principle to a bareness of expression more native to English. Of italics for emphasis we do not approve at any time, nor do we like "nay" as a rendering for *adeo*, *immo*, or any other word; but we have noted that English, as opposed to American, translators favor both. Positive errors are hard to find and the general tone is for the most part vigorous. The lay reader will find the version upon the whole as readable as a tedious speech can well be made.

NORMAN W. DEWITT

*Victoria College, University of Toronto*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*L'Acropole: Revue du monde Hellénique*, IX, Fasc. 3-4, Nos. 35-36 (Juillet-Décembre, 1934), pp. 113-68. Paris: Budé, 1934.

ALBRECHT, OTTO E. *Four Latin Plays of St. Nicholas from the 12th Century Fleury Play-Book: Text and Commentary, with a Study of the Music of the Plays, and of the Sources and Iconography of the Legends*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Milford, 1935. Pp. x+160. \$2.00.

APFEL, HENRIETTA VEIT. *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Demetrius ΗΕΡΙ ΕΦΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ ("De elocutione") and Longinus ΗΕΡΙ ΤΨΩΤΖ ("De sublimitate")*. Dissertation. Hunter College, N.Y.: The Author, 1935. Pp. xii+124.

CHERNISS, HAROLD. *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. xvi+418. \$4.00.

CONWAY, R. S. P. *Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus: Edited with Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1935. Pp. xiv+150. \$3.00.

CURTIS, HEBER D., and ROBBINS, FRANK E. *An Ephemeris of 467 A.D.* ("Publications of the Observatory of the University of Michigan," Vol. VI, No. 9, pp. 77-100.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935.

DONNELLY, FRANCIS P. *Cicero's Milo: A Rhetorical Commentary*. New York: Bruce, 1935. Pp. viii+247. Catalogue, \$1.24; list, \$0.93.

Friedrich August Wolf: *Ein Leben in Briefen*. Die Sammlung besorgt und erläutert durch SIEGFRIED REITER. Erster Band: *Frühzeit* (Hallische Meisterjahre, 1779-1807), mit acht Abbildungen und fünf Schriftproben, pp. xxxvi+436. Zweiter Band: *Berliner Leidens- und Alterstage (1807-1824)*, Entwurf einer Selbstbiographie, mit zehn Abbildungen und einer Schriftprobe, pp. 345. Dritter Band: *Erläuterungen*, pp. 342. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1935.

GROSE-HODGE, H., and DAVIES, E. W. *Verres in Sicily: Being Selections from Cicero's Verrine Orations*. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1935. Pp. 133. \$0.64.

GRUBE, G. M. A. *Plato's Thought*. London: Methuen, 1935. Pp. xviii+320. 12s. 6d. net.

Hermathena: *A Series of Papers on Literature, Science, and Philosophy by Members of Trinity College, Dublin*. No. XLIX (1935). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, & Co., 1935. Pp. 211. 6s.

HINMAN, W. S. *Literary Quotation and Allusion in the "Rhetoric," "Poetics" and "Nicomachean Ethics" of Aristotle*. Dissertation. Staten Island, N.Y.: The Author, 1935. Pp. 201. Paper, \$1.50; cloth, \$2.00.

JONG, J. J. DE. *Apologetiek en Christendom in den Octavius van Minucius Felix: With a Summary in English*. Dissertation. Maastricht: Boosten & Stols, 1935. Pp. iv+132.

KEENAN, SISTER MARY EMILY. *The Life and Times of St. Augustine as Revealed in His Letters*. Dissertation. (Catholic University of America, "Patristic Studies," Vol. XLV.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1935. Pp. xx+221.

LEUZE, OSCAR. *Die Satrapieneinteilung in Syrien und im Zweistromlande von 520-320*. ("Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft," *Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse*, 11. Jahr, Heft 4.) Halle (Saale): Niemeyer, 1935. Pp. x+157-476. RM. 20.

- LIVINGSTONE, R. W. *Greek Ideals and Modern Life*. ("Martin Classical Lectures," Vol. V.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. x+175. \$2.00.
- MAROUZEAU, J. *Traité de stylistique appliquée au Latin*. ("Collection d'études Latines: Série scientifique," No. 12.) Paris: Société d'Édition *Les Belles Lettres*, 1935. Pp. xx+330.
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. XII. American Academy in Rome, 1935. Pp. 184; pls. 17.
- MORROW, GLENN R. *Studies in the Platonic Epistles: With a Translation and Notes*. ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XVIII, Nos. 3-4.) Urbana: University of Illinois, 1935. Pp. 234. \$3.00.
- PEASE, ARTHUR STANLEY (ed.). *Publī Vergili Aeneidos liber quartus*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. ix+568. \$6.00.
- PINDARI *Carmina cum fragmentis recognovit brevique adnotazione critica instruxit* C. M. BOWRA. Oxford: Clarendon, 1935. Pp. xii+286 (unnumbered). \$3.00.
- PLUMPE, JOSEPH C. *Wesen und Wirkung der Auctoritas maiorum bei Cicero*. Dissertation. Bochum-Langendreer: H. Pöppinghaus, 1935. Pp. 76.
- REUSCH, WILHELM. *Der Kölner Münzschatzfund vom Jahre 1909: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des römischen Köln*. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Pp. iv+32. Mit 6 Lichtdrucktafeln. RM. 4.
- RICHARDS, G. C. *Cicero: A Study*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1935. Pp. x+298. \$3.00.
- RUSSELL, J. C., and HEIRONIMUS, J. P. *The Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches Relating to England*. (Mediaeval Academy of America, "Studies and Documents," No. 1.) Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1935. Pp. xxiv+162. \$2.00; to members of the Academy, \$1.60.
- SCHULTE, WILLIAM H. *Index verborum Valerianus*. ("Iowa Studies in Classical Philology," No. 3.) Dubuque: The Author, Columbia College, 1935. Pp. 180. \$2.50.
- SHEWAN, ALEXANDER. *Homeric Essays*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Pp. xiv+456. 21s. net.
- TILL, RUDOLF. *Die Sprache Catos*. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXVIII, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Pp. vi+102. RM. 6.20; geb. RM. 7.20.
- Union Académique Internationale: Compte rendu de la seizième session annuelle du comité (13-16 Mai, 1935)*. Bruxelles: Secrétariat Administratif de l'U. A. I., Palais des Académies, 1935. Pp. 48.
- DEMAN, ESTHER BOISE. *The Building of the Roman Aqueducts*. Washington: Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1934. Pp. xii+440. Pls. 59; text cuts 49.
- WALDE, ALOIS. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage, von J. B. HOFMANN. Lieferung 8: *fulmen-(h)erctum*, pp. 561-640. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1935. RM. 1.50.
- WILD, L. N. *Burke's Observations on a Late Publication Entitled "The Present State of the Nation."* (Chancellor's Prize for Latin Prose Composition, 1935.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Pp. 15. 2s. net.
- WILLMS, HANS. EIKON: *Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Platonismus*, Teil I: "Philon von Alexandre." Mit einer Einleitung über Platon und die Zwischenzeit. Münster: Aschendorff, 1935. Pp. viii+124. RM. 6.
- WIRTH, HERMAN. *Die heilige Urschrift der Menschheit*. Lieferung 13, pp. 673-768. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1935. RM. 6.

,"  
les  
les  
in  
nd  
(4.)  
ge,  
til  
0.  
is-  
in  
+  
'p.  
ry  
es  
a,  
al  
0.  
6.  
ft  
le  
"  
n:  
e  
0.  
ut  
(4)  
d  
3.